SALEM CHURCH DAM, RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA.

[No. 84-4]

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 192

TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 526 OF THE 79TH CONGRESS, SECTION 10 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT, JULY 24, 1946 (RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER)

APRIL 25, 1955

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
63236 WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, JR., Alabama
JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
TOM STEED, Oklahoma
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
BRADY GENTRY, Texas
M. G. (BURNIE) BURNSIDE, West Virginia
IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, Georgia
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, JR., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
PAUL ROGERS, Florida

GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan
J. HARRY McGREGOR, Ohio
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
MYRON V. GEORGE, Kansas
FRANK J. BECKER, New York
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa
BRUCE ALGER, Texas
ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania
DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Massachusetts

CHARLES G. TIERNEY, *Chief Counsel*
ROBERT F. MCCONNELL, *Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
ROBERT E. JONES, JR., Alabama
T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana
JIM WRIGHT, Texas
W. R. HULL, JR., Missouri
KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois
FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania
PAUL G. ROGERS, Florida

RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
FRANK J. BECKER, New York
ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., California
FRED SCHWENGEL, Iowa

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of H. R. 192	1
Statement of—	
Bates, Marvin, on behalf of several Ruritan Clubs in Culpeper County	44
Cary, Miles, operating manager, Virginia Electric & Power Co	35
Gouldman, Francis B., member, House of Delegates, General Assembly of Virginia	28
Graham, W. R., farmer, Culpeper County, Va	55
Griffith, F. D., dairy farmer, representing Culpeper County Farm Bureau	47
Hawkins, Earl, dairy farmer, Culpeper, Va	52
Hudgins, Alexander, executive secretary, Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives, etc	25
Hurt, Ward H., dairy farmer and director of Culpeper National Bank	48
Jones, Otis B., partner, Rapidan Milling Co	74
Low, Dr. George W., Jr., plant manager, Sylvania Division, American Viscose Corp., Fredericksburg, Va	32
Potter, Walter B., director, Culpeper Chamber of Commerce	50
Pruett, George Raymond, farmer, Culpeper County, Va	53
Robinson, Charles A., Jr., staff engineer, National Rural Electric Cooperation Association	18
Scholtz, H. F., farmer, Faquier County, Va	67
Scott, Mrs., of Elkwood, Va	79
Smith, Hon. Howard W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia	12
Thomas, Mr. and Mrs. Farrell, farmers, Culpeper County, Va	71
von Sprecken, T. M., chief engineer, Southern Railway Co	38
Whipple, Col. William, Corps of Engineers, Army	3
Yates, Connor, member, Board of Supervisors of Culpeper County, Va	46
Additional information—	
Bird, Lt. Col. Byron, Corps of Engineers, letter, May 17, 1946, to W. R. Graham	57
Culpeper Chamber of Commerce, resolution submitted by Walter B. Potter, director	50
Finucane, Charles, Acting Secretary, Army, report, April 25, 1955, to Hon. Charles A. Buckley	1
Hoffman, E. Murphy, petition signed by, and 99 others, submitted by Hon. Norman Bailey, State Senator from Orange County, Va	80
Robinson, Charles A., Jr., staff engineer, National Rural Electric Association:	
Allin, J. R., manager, Northern Neck Electric Cooperative, Inc., Warsaw, Va., letter, April 22, 1955	19
Brown, W. H., manager, Virginia Electric Cooperative, Bowling Green, Va., letter, April 22, 1955	20
Submitted statement	21

SALEM CHURCH DAM, RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL
OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 1304, New House Office Building, Hon. Clifford Davis (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DAVIS. We come next to H. R. 192, to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946—Rappahannock River.

At this point in the record let H. R. 192 be made a part of the record, as well as a report from the Department of the Army submitted to the chairman of this committee, Charles A. Buckley, on April 5, 1955.

(H. R. 192 is as follows:)

[H. R. 192, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend Public Law 526 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 526 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River) be amended by striking out the proviso which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That the power pool shall be maintained at an elevation not to exceed two hundred and twenty feet.".

(The report of the Department of the Army is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of the Army with respect to H. R. 192, 84th Congress, a bill to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River).

The Department of the Army has considered the above-mentioned bill. The purpose of the bill is to amend the authorization for the Salem Church Reservoir on the Rappahannock River, Va., contained in the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641) by striking out the proviso which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That the power pool shall be maintained at an elevation not to exceed two hundred and twenty feet."

Authorization of Salem Church Reservoir was based upon House Document 119, 80th Congress, in which the Chief of Engineers' recommendations were based on a power pool elevation of 240 feet. The limitation of 220 feet included in the 1946 Flood Control Act was to reduce the amount of land required for the reservoir. Under present conditions, project operation at a power pool elevation of 240 feet would be the most satisfactory from an engineering and

economic standpoint. Adoption of H. R. 192 would remove the present restriction and would approve planning and construction of the project as recommended in House Document 119.

The Department of the Army has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 192 as it would improve the status of the Salem Church project. Under this legislation the project would be built and operated with a maximum power pool at elevation 240. It should be noted, however, that further studies will be required to determine definitely the justification of this improvement under the present conditions and methods of project evaluation prior to further consideration for construction.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES FINUCANE,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

Mr. DAVIS. We have our colleague, Judge Smith, with us. Judge, would you prefer that the engineers make an opening statement on the technical features?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think that would be highly desirable, so that they would know what it is, but if I might have just a moment before you do that?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are present here a great many people from the area involved. There are many landowners and many, many organizations, as well as many of the governing bodies in the various areas through which this dam will go. They would all like to be heard. I do not imagine that the committee is going to have time to hear everybody who wants to be heard and I just wanted to see what your procedure will be. I assume you will allocate a certain time to the proponents and a certain time to the opponents. I think we can save time by getting that straightened out in advance.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. This committee likes to hear everybody who requests an opportunity to be heard, but somebody tells me that we have 85 witnesses here and I am sure the testimony will be cumulative. I am just wondering. Most of the witnesses come from the opposition; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think in numbers, yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there one spokesman for the opposition who would care to rise now to help us to clarify this matter? Is there any one person representing the opposition who would like to speak for them?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understood the Virginia Electric Power Co. was one opponent that would like to have some time.

Mr. CARY. Yes. We ought to have one witness who would not take over 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Who will speak for them?

Mr. CARY. Mr. Miles Cary.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Someone said something about the Southern Railroad having one witness who will take about 5 minutes. That will dispose of two of them.

Mr. DAVIS. Pardon me, Judge. Let me suggest that the opponents step outside. I hate to ask that, but I think that is the most convenient thing at the moment. Would you mind stepping outside and returning with a designation of, let us say, 5 or 6 or 7 witnesses who would represent all of you, because so much of it would be cumulative, or if we have room in our adjoining office there, you could meet there. Is that satisfactory with you?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe if we could divide the time between the opponents and the proponents, with each of us having 1 hour, we could finish within that period of time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is Mr. Norman Bailey, member of the legislature of Orange County, Va.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, Mr. Bailey. I understand you would like to have 1 hour and you will divide it among your group?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir; four counties.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That will cover all the opposition?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Fine.

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, it is to be understood that every individual has a right to submit a statement for the record, even though he be not heard orally. Is there any objection on the part of any member of this committee to our allowing the opposition 1 hour? We do not have a legislative program today.

Mr. THOMPSON. How much time will the proponents ask for?

Mr. DAVIS. How much time will you require, Judge?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Fredericksburg will be represented by Mr. Francis Gouldman, a member of the legislature from Fredericksburg. The REA folks would like to make a brief statement, which will not take very long. There are a few other proponents. Dr. Low, plant manager of the Sylvania Corp. at Fredericksburg, which is vitally interested, would like a brief time.

Is there any other interest in favor of the dam present? I would require a few minutes to present to you the various and sundry resolutions of various organizations in favor of the dam.

Mr. DAVIS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DAVIS. I think now it is proper for us to hear from Colonel Whipple, representing the Corps of Engineers.

STATEMENT OF COL. W. WHIPPLE, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Colonel WHIPPLE. Mr. Chairman, the Salem Church multiple-purpose dam reservoir was authorized in the 1946 Flood Control Act.

Mr. DAVIS. Let us have as much order as possible. We have so many witnesses present and there are so many in the room that I know it is difficult.

Colonel WHIPPLE. The Salem Church multiple-purpose dam and reservoir was authorized in the 1946 Flood Control Act for the purposes of power and flood control. The dam at that time was envisaged as a dam with a normal pool of 240 feet above mean sea level, with flood control storage to be provided above that point.

At the time the project was authorized a limitation was included in the bill requiring that the normal pool elevation be not higher than 220 feet mean sea level, and the dam was authorized on that basis.

Since that time, advance planning funds in the amount of $145,000 were made available on the basis of which design studies were undertaken to determine the feasibility and the design provisions for the project under the limitation under which it had been authorized. As a result of these investigations the design aspects of the project were fixed with a storage capacity available of 783,000 acre-feet. It was

found that flood-control storage to be reserved in the amount of 223,000 acre-feet was substantially that contemplated in the project document, with 330,000 acre-feet of storage reserved for power.

The maximum head for power under this restriction as to height would be 156 feet.

These figures contrasted with a contemplated storage in the original survey studies of approximately 600,000 acre-feet for power storage and a maximum height of about 176 feet for power.

So that if we regarded the project as it would exist with this limitation as to height, it was apparent that the head available for power was reduced by 20 percent, and that the storage available for power would be about half what had been contemplated at the time that the dam was originally recommended.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

Mr. DAVIS. Surely, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES. In the report in 1946 accompanying the bill, Report No. 2165, appears the limitation of 220 feet. Why was the restrictive language written into the bill? Will you give us the reason for that?

Colonel WHIPPLE. It is my understanding, sir, that this was written into the bill as a result of objections of landowners and people resident in the vicinity against the flooding of the lands at the higher elevation.

Mr. JONES. And you understood in 1946 that that restriction would be carried out. Why is it that you have come in now and asked that the situation be changed?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Sir, for the record, we have not made a request. We have not made an investigation or a survey of the 240-foot dam. We have not made a definite recommendation as to the height of this dam since the 1946 report.

Mr. JONES. According to the letter of the Secretary of the Army then, or the Acting Secretary of the Army, directed to Mr. Buckley on the 5th of April this year, it states:

> It should be noted, however, that further studies will be required to determine definitely the justification of this improvement under present conditions and methods of project evaluation prior to further consideration for construction.

In the face of that language, would it be necessary for you to obtain more planning money to determine the economic feasibility of the proposed project?

Colonel WHIPPLE. To make a definite determination it would be necessary for us to make further investigations.

Mr. JONES. Therefore we cannot report the bill until that engineering data is submitted to the committee.

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think you will have to make up your minds on that. I think that is essentially correct as regards the final determination of the characteristics of the dam at the higher elevation.

Mr. JONES. Then should we not continue the hearing on the bill until some engineering report is made available by the Corps of Engineers?

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think that is for the discretion of the committee.

Mr. JONES. That is all.

Mr. BECKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. It is my understanding that this bill we have before us, restricts the elevation to 220 feet in accordance with the 1946 act?

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir. The 1946 act restricted the elevation to 220 feet normal elevation, whereas the original surveys had contemplated the dam to be at 240-foot elevation. This bill would operate to remove the restriction and allow the dam to be constructed as contemplated in the original report.

Mr. DECKER. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. You may proceed. You have not concluded your statement, have you?

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like to ask one question, Colonel. The report of the Acting Secretary of the Army says that the—

> Department of the Army has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 192 as it would improve the status of the Salem Church project. Under this legislation the project will be built and operated with a maximum power pool at elevation 240.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir. As a result of these investigations, Mr. Chairman, we took the dam with that limitation and the amount of storage and head available and worked out the best development for power and flood control that was possible with those limitations. We found we could have an installed capacity of 64,000 kilowatts to generate an annual average energy of 151 million kilowatt-hours annually, and proceeded to evaluate flood-control and power benefits from an installation of that type and the storage that was available for flood control. We made preliminary cost estimates of the dam of that height, or fairly good cost estimates of a dam of that height, and found that that dam would require at present price levels $46 million to construct. We evaluated the benefits and costs fairly accurately and determined that that dam would be economically infeasible and would not merit construction at that elevation.

So we have come, and we came at that time, to a definite conclusion that the dam as authorized was economically infeasible with the height limitation and should not be built. Therefore we did not request further planning funds and have made no effort to put the project in the waiting list for construction. As a matter of fact, in categorizing the projects in our program, which we did last year, we separated out the projects which were economically feasible and on which construction could proceed when funds were available and planning was complete. We called that our active program. Other projects we categorized as inactive projects, which were unworthy, and other projects which were marginal, or which seemed as though they might possibly be feasible at some other time. We considered those in the category of deferred for restudy.

The project of Salem Church was put in the category of being deferred for restudy, and so reported to your committee and to the Bureau of the Budget. On the current criteria such a project cannot be constructed without the submission of a revised report to your committee and to the Bureau of the Budget. We know definitely then that this project with the restriction is economically infeasible. We also know that the project with the higher elevation which is now proposed, would be from the point of view of power and flood control a better project, because these limitations would not so severely affect it.

63236—55——2

You would have more head and greater storage. We believe that the original survey indicated that from the point of view of power particularly the higher dam was required in order to get the best engineering and optimum development of the site from an engineering standpoint. That is why the statement was made in the report to which the chairman referred:

Adoption of H. R. 192 would remove the present restriction and would approve planning and construction of the project as recommended in House Document 119.

However, we have not completed any recent engineering or economic analysis of the project at the higher elevation. We cannot state definitely what the benefit-cost ratio would be. We have not resolved the problems which are normally resolved during the planning process for a project of this type before construction is initiated. That is why I answered Mr. Jones' question that we cannot at this time state definitely what the economic feasibility of that project would be at the higher elevation.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, if we should pass H. R. 192 it would simply authorize the Corps of Engineers to make additional studies to determine whether or not the dam should exceed 220 feet. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. JONES. No, sir.

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think it would do that, and it would authorize planning studies, but it would go further than that. It would authorize the subsequent construction of the project without further authorization action by the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. And it is your opinion you would not be required to return to this committee after you make these additional studies, for authorization?

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir. We would not. If this bill is passed we would not have to return for further authorization prior to construction of the project at the higher elevation.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any questions? Mr. Jones? Anybody else?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the colonel just a couple of questions here.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Colonel, I believe you said your original survey took in the higher elevation of 240 feet.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. And it was on the basis of that that you now believe there might be some reason for going back to that original plan of having your dam built at the 240-foot level. Is that right?

Colonel WHIPPLE. On the basis of that and general experience in developments of this character it is apparent that you get proportionately more power at the higher elevation than you would proportionately increase the cost of the dam.

Mr. ROGERS. Did you take into consideration the economic benefits at the time when that original survey was made?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir. We did. Although, of course, the economic conditions have changed and our criteria have changed since that time. So the results of that original survey are not completely applicable at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS. I can understand that, but even at that time it did warrant 240 feet or more?

Colonel WHIPPLE. At that time it was very definitely preferable from the engineering point of view and power point of view to have a dam at the higher elevation.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you know why this restriction was put in of 220 feet?

Colonel WHIPPLE. As I understand it, the restriction was put in at 220 feet on account of the objections of people living in and adjacent to the reservoir area to having certain areas of land flooded.

Mr. ROGERS. Based on the survey and the facts you have at hand now, you see reason for consideration for raising this to 240 feet, which would be accomplished under this resolution?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Sir, we are not in a position of having a basis on which to make a firm recommendation. We have testified that there is no objection to this. We are sure it would improve the engineering aspects, but we have not completed either a planning or survey report since the 1946 report, and therefore I cannot make a firm recommendation at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. But your 1946 report even was favorable to this.

Colonel WHIPPLE. The 1946 report was definitely favorable to the higher elevation.

Mr. ROGERS. What has changed? What is the major change in your economic survey that would reflect any difference in the situation?

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think it is apparent that even at the time of the 1946 report as shown by the action of the Congress there was very substantial objection from the people in the area whose land would be taken. There are certain other aspects with respect to pollution and the relationship to the Fredericksburg project downstream that have not been fully resolved and that we would resolve in an investigation before we would make a firm recommendation of this nature.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Mr. JONES. I have one other question. How much land would be required for the reservoir of 220 feet?

Colonel WHIPPLE. We now have a policy of acquiring lands in fee only those that are going to be flooded a considerable portion of the time, and taking the other lands in easement. The approximate amount that would be taken by both fee and easement under our current real-estate practices for the dam at the lower elevation would be 31,000 acres.

Mr. JONES. And how much would you acquire under the 240-foot figure?

Colonel WHIPPLE. We do not have a firm figure for the 240 because we have not made very many studies of that. It would require several thousand acres in addition, but I cannot give you an exact figure.

Mr. JONES. That is all.

Mr. BECKER. Is it apparent, Colonel, that the same objections would arise today that arose originally when the higher elevation was contemplated?

Colonel WHIPPLE. From the list of witnesses present, sir, I would regard that as probable.

Mr. BECKER. An understatement. You mentioned a figure of $46 million before. I did not quite get where the $46 million figure came in. Would that be a rough estimate for the higher elevation?

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir; that is a firm estimate for the lower elevation.

Mr. BECKER. I see. There is no objective estimate for the higher elevation?

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir; it would obviously cost more money, but we have made no definite cost estimate for the higher elevation since it was not authorized.

Mr. BECKER. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any other questions on this side?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. First let me say this: You say you cannot give us a breakdown on the estimate of benefits and costs on this higher elevation.

Colonel WHIPPLE. That is correct. I can give you substantially the benefits and I can give you the increased power and tell you how much it would be, but I cannot give you complete benefits or costs for the higher elevation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. So in effect you are asking us to pass this bill that has been objected to before——

Colonel WHIPPLE. No, sir; we are not in a position of asking you to pass the bill.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One other question. The Federal Power Commission made an estimate that in 1955 there would be a shortage of power in the area of 120,000 kilowatts. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five is here. Is there a shortage of power there that you know of?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Sir, I cannot state definitely that there is a shortage of power, because the question about what constitutes a shortage of power is a difficult one. There is always, in any well-regulated utility area, a considerable surplus of reserve capacity above peaks. So statistics will always verify that.

On the other hand, in this part of the country as in other parts of the country, demands for power are growing. We have not made a complete resurvey of that, but we have reason to believe that this power could be absorbed in the market.

Now, whether you would go so far as to say there is a shortage of power in this area, I am inclined to think you would be going too far.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. I have been on this committee a long time, but this is the first circumstance of this character I have ever encountered.

In other words, the Corps of Engineers comes in and says, "We do not ask you to pass this bill. We have no objection to the enactment of it."

Now this is what gets me. Maybe this is not quite as elegant language as I should use, but the Corps of Engineers says, "The adoption of H. R. 192 would remove the present restriction and approve planning and construction of the project as recommended in House Document 119." That does not look like it is in conformance to our procedure in the past.

In other words, we adopt this and you can go on then and approve it and instead of going ahead at 240 feet—and I am just thinking out loud now—you might, after you do some further studying, decide on 260 feet and take that much more land and just go about your business with it. I am not clear about your statement, Colonel, and the statement of the Acting Secretary of the Army. It just appears there should be some reason for you to come back to this committee and let us know about it, because after all, if we just give you blanket authority then we are through with it.

Have you any comment on that at all?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Sir, I would certainly agree with the chairman that this is not a usual situation. We normally come before your committee when we have completed economic and engineering evaluations of a project. We are normally able to answer fully to a reasonable extent at least your questions as to the economic and engineering aspects concerned. That is not the case here.

We have here a report which was prepared and submitted over 10 years ago, and which is not completely up to date. We also have a bill which proposes a project which would improve certain aspects of what would otherwise be an infeasible project. But since we have had no survey investigation and have not had any other type of authorization or funds for investigating the higher elevation project, in view of the limitation in the authorizing act, unfortunately we are not able to be as clear and specific in answering questions as we would like to be when we come before you.

Mr. DAVIS. Colonel, could you make an estimate of the cost of this additional planning? Ordinarily when you come in you say that the Corps of Engineers will state that this survey will cost so much money. You name a figure, which may be $15,000 or $100,000. Have you any idea as to the cost of this additional planning?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir; I have. If this bill were to be passed by the committee we would then come in for a request for planning funds to make the next step of planning, an up-to-date feasibility determination at the higher elevation, and that step would cost approximately $50,000. If that were favorable then we would submit a report to remove the project from the category of deferred for restudy, where it is at the present time. On that being accomplished, then we would proceed to complete the planning and design in the usual way. We would not request planning funds to complete the design of this project until it had been determined in accordance with up-to-date criteria that the project was feasible and acceptable at the higher elevation.

Mr. DAVIS. After you spent the first $50,000 for the first phase of the plan and then you found that you had to change your design and had to spend some more planning money in that direction, then where would you go for authority to spend that money on the additional planning?

Colonel WHIPPLE. When the authorization is complete, if you would authorize the dam at the higher elevation that would complete authorization action. Then we would go to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for the planning funds as we normally do for authorized projects.

Mr. DAVIS. I am still confused. You say you would come back if we would authorize you to build it at a higher elevation and then go to the Appropriations Committee?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. I was never so confused about anything in my life.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I understand the colonel correctly, you are saying first that you want us to pass this bill, which means we give a blanket authorization to build the dam so far as we are concerned in this committee. But after that they are going to make a survey to determine what kind of a dam should be built. I do not understand the sequence of events.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Maybe I had better recapitulate and try to make it clear again.

Mr. DAVIS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Colonel WHIPPLE. This project is now an authorized project. As in the case of a number of other authorized projects across the country, and in fact about $4 billion worth, we have determined projects have been authorized which are not worthy of proceeding with construction on at this time because they do not meet up-to-date criteria. That action was taken by the Chief of Engineers as an administrative action.

All of these projects still have congressional authorization to construct, but it so happens that these authorizations are obsolete and the projects do not meet current criteria. Some of them are marginal and some of them are no good at all for one reason or another. Many of these authorizations go back to the 19th century. The projects still remain authorized for construction. So we have taken administrative action to put a number of projects, including this project, on the shelf.

Now we do not come before your committee and request that this authorization be changed. The legislation to remove this limitation was not initiated by us. We have not officially recommended it. We have stated through the Department of the Army that we have no objection to its being enacted because apparently it would improve the engineering aspects of the dam from the point of view of power. If the committee wishes to remove that restriction then we would proceed to request planning funds from the Appropriations Committees and proceed further with planning.

However, because of the fact that this project was categorized as deferred for restudy, or put on the shelf, the first step in that planning would be the initiation of a study of feasibility, to see whether we should continue further with detailed planning. That study is similar to studies we are requesting funds for from the Appropriations Committee this year for a number of projects. In those cases we submit the request only for a relatively small amount of planning funds—not for detailed design, but for a more general study. The results of that study are sent to the Public Works Committees and to the Bureau of the Budget. However, they do not require authorization action. That merely requires the sanction of the committees to put the project in our active list, which is an administrative matter in authorization procedure.

Mr. CRAMER. Colonel, as I understand it, you would resubmit this project after your feasibility report, but actually under the present authorization it would not be essential to do that, would it, in that you already have authorization?

Colonel WHIPPLE. We would have complete authorization and it is not legally required that we go through this procedure of sending the reports to the committees, but we have initiated that procedure as an administrative matter.

Mr. CRAMER. You could change your administrative procedure at any time and simply say that this was authorized initially and now the feasibility reports show that shelving of it was improper, so that you will put it back on the active list.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Since we have officially reported to the chairman of the committee that we are going to carry out that procedure, I presume we will carry it out.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, would it not be a proper procedure then under the circumstances to entertain a simple resolution authorizing a survey under the new plans and defer action on this legislation until the Corps of Engineers were able to give us a survey on X number of feet as to what would be feasible, and then act on that basis on this type of legislation?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there is no need for a resolution of authorization for the Corps of Engineers to make additional studies of an authorized project. It can be done by an appropriation for planning, and if it is not economically feasible there would be no other work on the project until there is a new authorization striking out the restrictions that are in existing legislation. Is that correct?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Sir, if I have understood you correctly, we cannot use planning funds to study anything but a project as authorized.

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Therefore, the granting of additional planning funds would not answer the purpose of studying the higher dam. We could only continue the studies of the lower dam, which our studies already indicated to be pointless.

Mr. JONES. But if the studies of the lower dam are proved unjustifiable then you report back to the Appropriations Committee and ask for a resolution of a study of the higher dam. Is that correct?

Colonel WHIPPLE. We can state right now that the lower dam is economically infeasible, and we do not wish to spend any more money studying it. We regard it as a project that, until conditions change at least, would not be feasible to proceed with.

Mr. JONES. Then Mr. Thompson's suggestion would be in order for the committee.

Colonel WHIPPLE. It would certainly allow progress to be made to determine that feasibility.

Mr. DAVIS. After Mr. Becker asks his question I want to ask Judge Smith if he can give us his opinion on it.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this: If there is in the law a restriction that this dam be limited to 220 feet?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir. There is a restriction.

Mr. BECKER. The point we are trying to resolve is, How could the Corps of Engineers go ahead with any type of survey or planning, or spending of any funds for a higher dam, if the law provides a restriction at 220 feet? This bill, as I see it, would have to be passed to eliminate the restriction at 220 feet before an authorization for funds is requested for additional planning.

Colonel WHIPPLE. First the bill would have to be passed or a committee resolution such has has been suggested which, of course, we can proceed under.

Mr. BECKER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. A committee resolution, it seems to me, would be the most expeditious manner of resolving this, where at least we would be out of this fog that the chairman mentioned a moment ago, and it would require only the action of this body.

Mr. DAVIS. I think you have made a real contribution, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. BALDWIN. The only question I was going to ask is if the committee resolution could be passed as it is while the present project is

clearly infeasible, certainly this bill does not cover the situation. The bill should require a cancellation of the authorization and start out with a survey on a new project. In effect, we pass the bill to authorize a project that has been clearly proven to be infeasible and the alternative, it seems to me, is either this resolution or a bill to cancel the original project and start over with a new survey.

Mr. DAVIS. I am inclined to think Mr. Thompson made a very sound suggestion as to the proper way to approach it. I have been thinking along that line which you expressed openly better than I could have done it.

Judge Smith, will you comment at this stage on the situation?

Colonel, I would like for you to wait just a moment, please.

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will do it now or I could do it at a later time. But I would like to comment a little more fully on the whole statement of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. I think you will help the committee materially if you will take the time to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will this be the time to do it?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was very much comforted by your statement that you were in a fog on this thing, because that is where I have been from the beginning. We do not have any dams in Virginia. We seem to have been left out of those very expensive projects. Therefore my familiarity with the operation of the Army engineers is less than nothing.

I would like to state that this is the same project. If this bill is passed this project will be authorized as it was authorized by this committee and by the House of Representatives 10 years ago. When it went over to the Senate the amendment was placed on it which limited it to 220 feet. Those interested in it thought at that time that that would get them a dam.

When the Army engineers investigated it they found, as the colonel said, that it was infeasible. Therefore it stopped there 10 years ago. All this bill does is take off the Senate amendment, and then they are where they were before. That is, that this committee having passed on the thing and found it feasible at 240 feet, then the Army engineers can proceed under the original authorization to find out just what the rest of the facts are. The only difference between what happened before this committee 10 years ago and what you authorized 10 years ago is that the Army engineers must now bring it up to date on the question of costs. Am I right, Colonel?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Costs and the benefits.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. The questions of costs and economic feasibility have to be reviewed again by this committee after this lapse of 10 years and these changes in the economic conditions. That is all there is to it.

I do not understand the relationship between the district engineer and the Army engineers. We have a district engineer for this area. That office consulted with the people interested in this dam from time

to time and had long consultations. The people who were interested in this dam understood that if this restriction put on by the Senate were lifted then they could proceed with the rest of the investigations necessary, and if they were satisfactory then they could go on and ask for their appropriation. That seemed to them and to us a simple way to do it.

Colonel Whipple is from the main office of the Army engineers. I though the district engineer would be here to express his views on the matter, because we proceeded on what we understood to be the idea of the district engineers as to how this thing should be done. As a matter of fact, the district engineer was in my office and in consultation with the people interested in this dam. The great question had been as to how much ground was going to be flooded by reason of this dam. Before I would touch the thing I asked the district engineer to have prepared for me a map, which I have here and which is now on display, showing just how much land would be flooded by the 220-foot level, and how much additional land would be flooded by the 240-foot level. That map shows the lines with the difference in areas between the 220-foot level and the 240-foot level. The colonel evidently is not familiar with that map because he was asked how much additional land would be flooded, and I think he said he did not have those figures. Those figures appear in the upper left-hand corner of the map prepared by the district engineer.

I had sort of thought maybe those boys would get together before we got around here, but apparently they have not. I would like to state to the committee just how much additional land would be flooded, as shown by the Army engineers. I do not know how much, but I am just taking the Army engineers' word for it. This gives the amount of land to be flooded. The great contention and the objection to this is because of the amount of farmland, which is of course the valuable part of the land that would be flooded by reason of the increase in the elevation of the dam from 220 feet to 240 feet.

According to the district engineer's map, which I am now pointing to, the farm and pasture acreage to be acquired in raising the dam an additional 20 feet would be 2,000 acres. A great deal of this land, as stated on this map, is woodland and wasteland. Much of it is owned by the Virginia Eelectric Power Co., which is in opposition to the erection of the dam.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does the map state the additional acreage of woodland and wasteland in addition to these 2,000 acres?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. You mean woodland? 8,000 acres. The total would be 10,000 acres additional land by reason of raising this 20 feet. That would be 10,000 extra acres, of which 8,000 acres would be woodland and 2,000 acres farmland, which is the valuable part of the land.

As I have stated, this dam at the 220-foot level was fully authorized by the action of this committee 10 years ago. May I reemphasize that the only difference between then and now is to determine what economic and cost changes and value changes there have been.

Should I proceed and finish my statement?

Mr. DAVIS. If you do not mind, I wish you would, Judge.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In the last 3 years this area in here has been very much affected by drought. These rivers almost dried up

during the last summer. That was the reason why the people who were interested in the construction of this dam became so very much alarmed about the water situation. It just looked like, if this were a permanent cycle, that sooner or later that whole country down there was just going to dry up.

I do not know whether the Army engineers take those conditions into consideration or not. I assume that they would in view of a rather definite change in the water courses in that area. But the lifeblood of the city of Fredericksburg economically lies in a large factory there of the Sylvania Co., which employs something like 2,000 people in that area. People work in that factory who come from all of the surrounding counties. Some of them come from the counties objecting to the construction of this dam. To take away from a sparsely settled area of that kind the employment of 2,000 or more people, you can just see what it would do to the economy of the whole region involved in this matter. That was the thing that brought it to a head again, because at the time that this area received temporary relief in the way of rainfall through what was known as Hurricane Hazel, which came last fall and renewed the water supply—before that happened this great factory down there and the city of Fredericksburg were reduced to a situation where they had 3 days of water supply ahead of them.

It may sound rather humorous, but the fact is that that condition had become so vital and so critical that a day or two before this hurricane came and renewed the watercourses the city of Fredericksburg met and passed a resolution to employ a rainmaker. That is what they told me. I mention it just to show how desperate the situation in that area is.

That is the reason, and it is the reason today, why these people are so vitally interested in it.

Someone just handed me a memorandum here that the Viscose Co. employs over 2,000 people. With 2,000 or more employees in that small area you can see what a large economic question is involved with a city of considerable size there and a large area, in what I am asking you to do here.

In asking you to do this I am doing it in opposition to the people that you are to hear from later in the day. I am simply asking you to remove the restriction that the Senate put on this.

That does not mean anybody is going to build a dam, I am sorry to say. If you will remove the restriction and put this bill back just where you put it in the first place 10 years ago, with a limitation of 240 feet, you merely reaffirm the action which your committee took 10 years ago, and then go on from there to determine, on the basis of the present conditions, the economic feasibility of the dam.

When you sift it down as to what is really in it, that is all there is in it.

I know there is a great deal of opposition to this. I know that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. is very much opposed to it. I know that people whose land is going to be taken are objecting to it, and I can sympathize with those people.

Mr. DAVIS. You have cleared it up a lot for me when you said that the limitation was put in in the Senate—in the other body.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. It was put on because of these objections. Of course, that killed it just as dead as if the Senate failed to pass it.

All I am asking you to do is what the House did 10 years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Judge, as I understand the proposition——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will you excuse me a second and let me make one statement that I overlooked?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The question was raised here, I think by Mr. Jones, that if we just took this limitation off then the Army engineers would have carte blanche to build it to 280 feet. I have recognized that objection to the bill and I want to say that when the committee gets ready to act, if they will be so good as to act favorably on this bill I want an amendment to the bill that will definitely limit it to 240 feet, because that is what I understood when I started out proposing this. I do not want to leave anything uncertain about it. So I am going to ask you to attach an amendment that will definitely put a limitation on it of 240 feet.

Now, Mr. Smith, I will be glad to answer your question.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In relation to that, Judge, as I understand the original report which was used as part of the authorization when this was first authorized back in 1946, it had 240 feet as the basis; did it not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. As such, the authorization called for a 240-foot dam at the time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is correct.

Colonel WHIPPLE. That is correct, although it is not definitely limited to that. We are definitely allowed a few feet leeway in our planning and the possibility of a higher dam was actually discussed in the report.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My commitment was to propose to you a 240-foot dam, and I do not want any doubt about that. I want it limited to that.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In other words, you want us by our passage of this bill, and the amendment which you propose, to change the authorization to a 240-foot dam and allow that to be put into a pool of authorized public works projects which the engineers have, and take its chances on getting appropriations through the normal procedures for construction?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is all I am asking. If conditions have changed so that it is not feasible, then it is not feasible.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Of course, to get appropriations the Army engineers would have to justify it under the present conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. And not as related to what it was 10 years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am wondering if in view of the waterfall situation in this country those economic considerations should not be modified so as to take into consideration the lack of rainfall.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It is evident that their consideration should have to include the increased demand for water for the city

of Fredericksburg, or any other area, when they make a justification for it before the Appropriations Committee.

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think that can be done within the scope of the planning.

Mr. JONES. I think the judge pointed out a very significant thing in his suggestion for reviewing the new necessities in regard to this bill, such as the lack of water which is mentioned. In addition to that I am quite sure this project has irrigation possibilities that we did not look into in 1946.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume that the Army engineers go by the criteria this committee lays down. I do not know whether that includes any change that has come about in the last few years by reason of the lack of rainfall all over the country, but it seems to me that it is a matter we have to give some consideration to now or later.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Has this industry in Fredericksburg which you referred to, developed in the past 10 years?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Since 1930.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Has it been at this place all along?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, it has expanded since 1930.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Judge, way back yonder there seems to have been some confusion, because the Governor in a report said that it also appeared if the power pool was limited to an elevation of 220 feet instead of 240 feet as proposed by the multiple-purpose dam, it would still remain a very satisfactory economic ratio. He was wrong then?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Who said that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Governor of Virginia.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The engineers have the last word on it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. And they found it was not feasible at 220 feet.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wonder if the engineers were asked for comment in the other body at the time the limitation was placed on it. I wonder what the Army engineers relation was to the 220 feet.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know, Mr. Thompson, but my guess is it was an amendment on the floor. However, I am not sure.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have a question, Mr. Chairman, which I guess could be directed at the colonel. If we amended this to 240 feet, it would still be the view of the Corps of Engineers we would have to go through the procedure of having a review study made to determine if the 240 feet or some other height is presently feasible?

Colonel WHIPPLE. We would not have to have a review study of a survey type; because if the limitation were raised to 240 feet by legislative action then we would proceed with our normal planning activities, which we do for all projects. Such matters as additional water supply and any other adjustments to bring the project up to date in accordance with the changed developments would then be made with planning funds, without the necessity of a committee resolution.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I think the judge clarified this. I feel sure with the amendment you have suggested, limiting it to 240 feet, there will be no necessity for coming back here. If this were passed with the amendment, the Army engineers could proceed with an economic feasibility report. Is that correct?

Colonel WHIPPLE. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As I said before, all I am asking your committee to do is to reaffirm what you did 10 years ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. In anticipation of further action on this legislation by this body, do we have reason to believe that the other body would now include the 240-foot provision that they would not include the other time, and give us more assurance of their considering it favorably if the survey were made first, prior to the passage of this legislation?

Mr. DAVIS. I doubt if anybody could answer that question.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Thompson, the other body would not have reduced it to 220 feet if they had not been advised that that was economically feasible at that height.

Mr. THOMPSON. By whom?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Governor of Virginia said he was so advised on that. Unless he was in error, that was the situation.

Mr. SMITH of Virigina. Probably the witnesses who opposed it advised that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They said at that time that 240 was the feasible number of feet.

Mr. THOMPSON. Evidently they must have had some advice other than the Governor's advice.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Maybe the Army engineers, I do not know. We get our expert testimony and information from the Army engineers. I do not know where the States get theirs.

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to ask whether the Army engineers considered a height of 220 feet at that time and have any figures to show the feasibility of the 220-foot height.

Colonel WHIPPLE. I was checking the project document to see what studies were made. There was consideration given to other heights of dams. On page 66 of House Document 119, 80th Congress, 1st session, there is a paragraph that deals with the elevation of the power pool at Salem Church Reservoir, and I will quote the pertinent factors.

The selection of the elevation of the maximum power pool level at the Salem Church Reservoir involves a consideration of two opposing factors: (1) The increase in economy and amount of available power from this national resource with a high-level power pool; and (2) the increase in flood hazard to the town of Remington and the necessary submergence of a limited amount of valuable farmland in the area with higher pool levels, a matter which has been the subject of local objection. To construct the project at a level lower than elevation 240 would still inundate farmlands, and those affected interests would desire consideration for still lower levels, a process that lacks an ultimate basis for decision without seeming discrimination. The economic considerations that have been made for determination of the proper level include adequate evaluation of damages to inundated farmlands. The selection of elevation 240 for the power pool level for the recommended project has been viewed as a reasonable balance between a maximum development of this important national resource and the wish to disturb to the smallest reasonable extent the existing social and economic life of the area.

So there is no definite statement about the 220-foot elevation pool in House Document 119. Consideration was given to elevations both above and below 240.

Mr. THOMPSON. 240 was said to be the lowest reasonable level.

Colonel WHIPPLE. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. So apparently the recommendation was that 220 feet was not feasible.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to consume any more time now. At a later time I wish to put into the record the resolutions from the governing bodies and other organizations in the various areas affected.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have other witnesses you want to introduce yourself, Judge? Mr. Charles A. Robinson of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; is he in the room?

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. ROBINSON, JR., STAFF ENGINEER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Come around, Mr. Robinson, and state your full name and the organization you represent.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Charles A. Robinson, Jr. I am staff engineer with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

I have a prepared statement which I would like to submit for the record and be permitted to highlight it orally, if possible.

Mr. DAVIS. It will be so ordered. You may summarize it and then submit the full statement for the record. You may proceed now, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, the REA-financed systems throughout the country, of which our association represents about 90 percent, have generally supported the construction of multiple-purpose projects which are feasible, and where hydroelectric power is included that can be marketed to our membership as preference customers.

I think, in speaking a little while ago, Judge Smith was largely speaking for his own district. I am sure of that because, as the committee is well aware, there are two Federal hydroelectric projects in operation at the present time in the southern part of Virginia. They are the 204,000-kilowatt John H. Kerr project, near South Boston, Va., and the 16,000-kilowatt, I believe, Philpot project in the western part of the State.

We feel actually in deciding whether or not the Salem Church project authorization will be amended to allow its operation at 240 feet the Congress will actually determine whether or not the project can be built, because of the fact that the Corp of Engineers, as Colonel Whipple has said, has found that the project is not feasible as it is presently authorized.

The Virginia rural electric cooperatives feel they have a substantial interest in supporting the construction of this project and consequently increasing its permissible pool level operation to 240 feet.

Twelve of the rural electric systems in Virginia are enjoying the benefits of low-cost power from the Kerr Dam project. There is a wheeling contract in force in Virginia between the United States and Virginia Electric & Power Co. by which the cooperatives of Virginia receive service as customers of the Government from the Federal project through the system of the Virginia Electric & Power Co. Through this agreement the cooperatives in Virginia have been able since 1952 to save approximately $316,998.34, because the rate to them from the Federal project is 6.81 mills per kilowatt-hour, while their alternative source of power is the Virginia Electric & Power Co., which has an established rate to rural electric cooperatives of 7.5 mills.

There is only a certain block of John H. Kerr power committed to the cooperatives in Virginia. Some of the cooperatives have already exceeded their allotment and others will exceed it in December 1955. It is estimated by December 1956 all of the power committed to the rural electric systems from the Kerr project will be exhausted. Therefore, the Salem Church project offers to our people a source of energy to supplement that which is available from the Kerr project now, but which is almost exhausted. In addition, we feel that if the wheeling concept can be extended to cover power from the Salem Church project when it is built, the rate for power from the Kerr project to our people may be slightly reduced because of the effect on the overall State pattern of providing a second point of power supply.

Under the contract between the Virginia Electric & Power Co. and the Southeastern Power Administration representing the Government, there are two zones set up for wheeling the Kerr project power. Within a radius of 100 miles of the project the Government pays 1 mill per kilowatt-hour to the company for wheeling. In a zone between 100 and 150 miles away the Government pays 1.75 mills to the company for wheeling; 43 percent of the load of the cooperatives lying in the second zone, that is, the 1.75-mill wheeling zone would be within 100 miles of the Salem Church project. As I say, if the wheeling concept can be extended to cover that project this 43 percent would be in the lower-priced wheeling zone.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, one cooperative, at Leesburg, Va., is unable to get Federal service from the Kerr Dam because of the fact that it is beyond the 150-mile maximum radius now provided by the wheeling contract. This cooperative is well within 100 miles of the Salem Church project.

Mr. Chairman, we have sufficient faith in the Corps of Engineers to believe that the project would not be built if it is restudied pursuant to the legislation now under consideration, and found to be infeasible at the 240-foot level. We do not think the Corps of Engineers would build an infeasible project.

Mr. Chairman, the Salem Church project would be a peaking capacity project, as are many other Federal projects throughout the country. That is, its primary purpose as applied to an electric system would be to take care of the peak loads of the interconnected utility company. It is our understanding that the Virginia Electric & Power Co., at the present time, is purchasing a substantial block of such peaking capacity from the John H. Kerr project at $10.80 a year, which we think affords them a substantial saving over maintaining steam capacity to meet peak loads.

Mr. Chairman, before closing I would like to submit for the record a letter from Mr. J. R. Allin of the Northern Neck Electric Cooperative of Warsaw, Va., in support of this project, if I may.

Mr. DAVIS. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

NORTHERN NECK ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Warsaw, Va., April 22, 1955.

Mr. CHARLES ROBINSON,
Engineer, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association,
Washington 6, D. C.

DEAR Mr. ROBINSON: Would you please appear on our behalf before the Public Works Committee on Monday, April 25, at 11 a. m., in connection with the Salem

Church project on the Rappahannock River. We have had keen interest in this project for many years. I appeared before one of the congressional committees concerning this matter several years ago. We were much disappointed that the Senate adopted an amendment reducing the height of the proposed dam to such an extent that it was not a feasible project. We are delighted that Judge Smith has again introduced a bill to make this a feasible project with a height of 240 feet.

Would you please express to the committee our desire that this project be approved and scheduled for construction at the earliest possible date. Our allocation of power from Buggs Island will be exceeded within the next 3 months.

Very truly yours,

J. R. ALLIN, *Manager.*

Mr. ROBINSON. Also I have a similar letter from Mr. W. H. Brown, manager of the Virginia Electric Cooperative at Bowling Green, Va., in support of this project.

Mr. DAVIS. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Bowling Green, Va., April 22, 1955.

Mr. CHARLES ROBINSON,
Engineering-Technical, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROBINSON: Enclosed herewith is copy of a letter, in duplicate, which the secretary of our cooperative has mailed to Congressman Howard Smith, showing our interest in the construction of Salem Church Dam, and the benefits that will be derived to our people. Our board discussed at its meeting last Monday, at great length, this important question. There is an abundant market for the power which could be generated if the dam were approved at the 240-foot level, so that power could be generatel which in turn would pay off the cost of this improvement. The result would be an important flood control, and regulated water supply, for very important industries in the downstream area which suffer for lack of steady water supply from the river.

A great many of our members earn their livelihood at the Sylvania plant near Fredericksburg, which has on occasion been threatened with shutdown, and loss of employment to our people because of low water periods, which Salem Church Dam would correct at no cost in the long run to the taxpayers. This water conservation project becomes increasingly important. Many claims have been made that the need for the project is much less now than it was 10 years ago. We are of the opinion that it is increasingly more important because of the rapidly receding ground water table in this area. These conditions are affecting, not only the farmers' water supply, but local industries, as I have mentioned above.

Our cooperative is justly concerned with the welfare and prosperity of its members in the area affected by Salem Church Dam. It is true that some hardships will result, because some good land will be taken out of cultivation, and some will necessarily have to move to other areas. This, however, has been grossly exaggerated by many opponents, because of misinformation being put out by people with selfish motives. Much good will result to the people generally, and the best interest of the majority should prevail, just as it does in any other question under democracy.

It is the fervent hope of our cooperative, and its board of directors, honestly representing the members, that selfish motives will not prevail and destroy the plans for this worthwhile undertaking by our Government for the benefit of the people generally.

Very truly yours,

W. H. BROWN, *Manager.*

Mr. ROBINSON. In summary, Mr. Chairman, we support the present legislation, H. R. 192, in the hope that the Salem Church project, if found feasible, will be constructed and electric power therefrom will be marketed in accordance with the provisions of the Federal power marketing legislation. The project would provide a supplemental source of energy to make up for the fact that the power allocated to us from the Kerr Dam is about exhausted, and probably, based on

a further study of economic considerations, would provide a rate reduction for power available to us from the Kerr project, because of the possibility of a redistribution of transmission costs. The project would also enable one additional cooperative at Leesburg, Va., now outside the maximum wheeling radius of the SEPA-VEPCO contract, to receive the benefit of Federal service.

That is all, Mr. Chairman, and I want to extend my appreciation for the privilege of appearing.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Charles A. Robinson is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. ROBINSON, JR., STAFF ENGINEER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee; my name is Charles A. Robinson, Jr. I am staff engineer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which is the national service organization for some 90 percent of all REA-financed electric type borrowers in the United States and Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, as you may know, our membership has long encouraged and supported authorization and construction of multiple-purpose river basin development projects throughout the country where they are economically justified and where the hydroelectric power installations included in them will provide our member systems with a source of low-cost abundant wholesale energy.

It is our understanding that in deciding whether or not the pool level operation of the Salem Church project shall be at elevation 240 feet, as originally planned by the Corps of Engineers, or at 220 feet, as provided by the Flood Control Act of 1946, the Congress is, in fact, deciding the practical question of whether or not the project is to be authorized or to remain effectively deauthorized. This is true, I think, because of the fact that subsequent to authorization of the Salem Church project by the Flood Control Act of 1946 for operation at a 220-foot elevation, the Corps of Engineers has determined that such operation would result in an economically unjustified project.

The rural electric systems of Virginia feel that they have a substantial interest in supporting authorization and construction of Salem Church as a feasible project. There are a total of 16 rural electric cooperatives in Virginia serving 100,000 farm families and rural establishments in all. Twelve of these systems, located within a 150-mile radius of the John H. Kerr multiple-purpose hydroelectric project on the Roanoke River, are currently receiving the benefit of low-cost Federal hydroelectric energy. Under a wheeling agreement between the Virginia Electric & Power Co. and the United States Department of the Interior, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, 60,000 kilowatts, representing one-third of dependable capacity of the John H. Kerr project, is firmed and transmitted to the cooperatives of Virginia as preference customers of the United States by the company. This wheeling service was initiated on November 19, 1952, pursuant to the contract, and up until the present time, the Virginia cooperatives have purchased a total of 418,012,706 kilowatt-hours from the Kerr project for which they have paid $2,845,125.80. This represents an average rate for wholesale energy to the rural electric systems of Virginia of 6.81 mills per kilowatt-hours. The only alternative source of wholesale energy for these Virginia systems is the Virginia Electric & Power Co. which has established a rate of 7.5 mills per kilowatt-hour for service to rural electric cooperatives. Based on a comparison between the 6.81 mills at which the cooperatives are purchasing from the Government and the 7.5 mill rate available from the company, the 12 systems now receiving power from the Kerr project have saved $316,998.34 since the inception of the Virginia wheeling contract.

However, the 60,000 kilowatts of capacity from the John H. Kerr project allotted to the cooperatives of Virginia is just about exhausted. The total demand of the Virginia electric cooperatives during their last peak period was 49,464 kilowatts. Five of the Virginia systems receiving Federal service have exceeded their contract demand with the Government and are purchasing supplemental energy from VEPCO at the 7.5-mill rate. During the next peak period, which will probably be experienced by the cooperatives next December, it is anticipated that an additional number of them will exceed their contract demand and will be obliged to purchase from the company. By December of 1956,

63236—55——4

all of the Virginia cooperatives will very likely have exceeded the maximum amount of power available to them from the Kerr project, and will be depending on VEPCO for supplemental service at the 7.5-mill rate.

It is the hope of the rural electric cooperatives in Virginia that the Salem Church project will afford them an incremental supply of Federal energy which would supplement their almost exhausted allocation of power from the Kerr project.

In addition, it is entirely possible that, conditioned on further economic studies of the Salem Church project, the power available from it would reduce the average rate of 6.81 mills per kilowatt-hour being paid by the cooperatives of Virginia for service from the John H. Kerr project. The 12 cooperatives to which the Southeastern Power Administration is delivering Kerr project power through the Virginia wheeling contract, are scattered from within a very few miles of the Kerr project itself to a maximum of 150 miles from the project. The United States Government is paying VEPCO 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for full energy wheeled from the Kerr project to preference customers whose delivery points lie within 100 miles from the project. For preference customers whose delivery points lie between 100 and 150 miles from the project, the Government is paying the Virginia Electric & Power Co. 1.76 mills per kilowatt-hour. The significance of this situation lies in the fact that, based on delivered capacity, 43 percent of all the cooperative load served by power delivered by the company for the account of the Government to cooperative load centers lying between 100 and 150 miles from the Kerr project is within a 100 mile radius of the proposed Salem Church project site. This 43 percent represents deliveries to 6 cooperatives with a combined contract demand of 22,000 kilowatts.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, one cooperative located at Leesburg, Va., is outside of the 150 mile radius within which the Virginia Electric & Power Co. has agreed to wheel John H. Kerr project power. It is, however, less than 60 miles from the proposed Salem Church project site, and presumably, would be within economic transmission distance of that project, or would be within a radius subject to the 1 mill wheeling charge if the wheeling contract concept were extended to include power from Salem Church.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on the Flood Control Act of 1946, the cost of the Salem Church project, designed with an installed capacity of 54,500 kilowatts, and with sufficient water to produce an estimated 153,070,000 kilowatt-hours per year, was estimated to cost $17,755,000. Inasmuch as this cost figure was probably based on construction costs prevalent in 1944 or even earlier, it is obviously out of date at the present time, and does not form the basis for any accurate indication of the benefits to cost ratio of the project as of 1955 cost levels. However, we are informed that pursuant to studies made subsequent to enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1946, which established the pool operating level of the project of 220 feet, the Corps of Engineers has definitely decided that a 220-foot project would be absolutely infeasible and not worthy of further consideration.

It would, therefore, seem, Mr. Chairman, in view of the potentially valuable source of power that will be afforded by the project and in view of the desire of the citizens of Fredericksburg to be protected from devastating floods, that it is only reasonable that the proposed legislation, H. R. 192, be enacted to raise the planned operating level of the project to 240 feet so that the Corps of Engineers may have a reasonable basis on which to conduct further studies for the purpose of determining whether or not a project designed to operate at the 240-foot elevation is economically feasible with respect to 1955 construction costs. If, after further study based on 240-foot level, the corps determines that the project is infeasible, it, of course, will not be built. On the other hand, if the corps determines that the project is still feasible at a 240-foot operating level, the Congress will have adequate opportunity to review the desirability of actual construction when the appropriation requests are considered. H. R. 192 does not in any way commit the Government to build the project, but in effect, merely reauthorizes it and allows the Corps of Engineers to make a thorough study on current construction price levels.

The Salem Church project, as previously designed, with an installed capacity of 54,500 kilowatts and with annual energy of 153,070,000 kilowatt-hours, would like many other Federal hydroplants, be predominantly a peaking project. The value of peaking capacity applied to a commercial utility company system lies in the fact that it can be utilized to help supply the peak loads of the company, thereby eliminating the necessity of building steam generating equipment to meet

peak loads. It is my understanding that at the present time the Southeastern Power Administration is selling to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. peaking capacity from the John H. Kerr project at about $10.80 per year whereas steam capacity costs from $15 to $20 per year. Peaking capacity is a very valuable asset to any commercial utility company system, and in many areas, including Virginia, the Federal Government is selling its peaking capacity to utility companies which, in return, deliver high load factor power to preference customers.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that the rural electric systems in Virginia and throughout the Nation support the construction of feasible multiple-purpose river basin projects. What we are asking at the present time is that the allowable pool level of the proposed Salem Church project in Virginia be increased from 220 to 240 feet. Operation at 220 feet is not economically justified, and increasing the authorized level to 240 feet will enable the Corps of Engineers to thoroughly study the project for the purpose of determining its feasibility under 1955 construction conditions.

We feel that if the project is constructed and the power marketed from it in accordance with the preference provisions of Federal power legislation, it will confer appreciable benefits on our rural electric systems in Virginia. It will supplement their allocation of Federal power from the Kerr project which is almost exhausted. It will also bring about a redistribution of transmission costs now associated with Federal power being delivered to the rural electric systems from the Kerr project, because the delivery points of 6 cooperatives lying within the 100 to 150-mile 1.75 mill wheeling zone of the Kerr project would be within a 100-mile radius of the Salem Church project. In addition, one cooperative located at Leesburg, Va., now excluded from the benefits of Federal power from the Kerr Dam because it is over 150 miles from the Kerr project, would be within economical transmission or wheeling distance of the Salem Church project. We feel that the benefits from the hydroelectric features of the project are important and warrant an authorization for operation at 240 feet so that the Corps of Engineers may arrive at a final conclusion as to whether the dam should or should not be constructed.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you for being here. Are there any questions?

Mr. BECKER. You stress as a part of your report or statement that the cost of producing the power by this method to the cooperative is 6.81, which is a much lower rate than the VEPCO rate of 7.5.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is substantially lower when you consider the fact that they have purchased many kilowatt-hours—418 million kilowatt-hours since the contract was put into effect.

Mr. BECKER. But VEPCO pays taxes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir. I assume they do.

Mr. BECKER. And the cooperative does not.

Mr. ROBINSON. It pays all taxes except the Federal income tax.

Mr. BECKER. Then there is a considerable difference in the taxes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. In other words, if the cooperative were paying on the same tax base as VEPCO there would not be any difference in the rate, would there?

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think this rate of 6.81 mills bears any relationship to income taxes. It is a rate from the Federal project.

Mr. BECKER. What I am getting at is simply the reason for the difference in the rate. In my State of New York we pay hundreds of millions to the Federal Government in taxes from the private power companies, which helps to support these projects. But why stress the difference in the low rate of the cooperative against the rate of VEPCO when it has no relationship to the amount of taxes the private company has to pay to the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON. You are saying that the rate from the Kerr project is lower because of the fact that the project, being a Federal project, does not pay taxes?

Mr. BECKER. Of course. Why make it a part of this project, as an inducement? I think if you are going to do that you ought to put in the relationship of taxes. That is all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Sir, we have one more witness—Mr. Alexander Hudgins, manager of the Virginia State Association of Electric Cooperatives.

Mr. CRAMER. I understood you to say this is solely a peak-load project. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON. I would not say it is solely a peak-load project, but I think it is predominantly one, because of the fact that it will have, as do a lot of Federal projects, a large block of capacity with a relatively small amount of energy available.

Mr. CRAMER. Under present circumstances, is it your opinion there will be sufficient demand for this power under peak-load conditions only to justify the project?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, sir, that of course would be a better question for the VEPCO representative to answer, since I assume most of the power from the project would be scheduled to meet the load of that company if it were taken into normal local distribution channels. I might say that the VEPCO is drawing a substantial portion of capacity from the Kerr project, which is also a predominantly peaking project.

Power companies throughout the country generally buy peaking capacity from these Federal projects to meet their peak loads and in return, through wheeling agreements, or other devices, are able to deliver high led-factor energy to the preference customers.

Mr. CRAMER. I understood that was largely the point of your testimony, and that it was to the effect that there is a need in the area for this project based largely on the fact that this would be a peak-load project largely and there would be a sufficient need for that in the future to justify the project.

Mr. ROBINSON. My argument was, I believe, that we were very hopeful, first of all, that the project would be built; and, secondly, that the wheeling concept which has been employed with respect to marketing power from the Kerr project could be extended to cover this project so that the power could be marketed to our cooperatives who are preference customers under the law.

To do this would probably require a wheeling-type contract, or Federal transmission lines. If a wheeling contract were arrived at between the company and the Southeastern Power Administration, which would be the normal marketing agent for this power, presumably the peaking ability of the project would be placed on the company system and the company would, in turn, furnish the preference customers with a certain amount of firm energy depending on the studies of the project and the agreement between the parties.

Mr. CRAMER. The point I was getting at, obviously, is whether or not the interest of REA in the area was largely as a result of needing additional supply, or because they thought they could get it from this source cheaper than what they are getting it for now.

Mr. ROBINSON. Both, sir. If the power from this project is marketed as Kerr Dam project power is marketed, we would probably get it cheaper than the 7.5 mill VEPCO rate; and, as I said, our present source of Federal power in the State of Virginia is about

exhausted. It would result in substantial savings if it were marketed in accordance with the preference provisions of law.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that all, Mr. Cramer?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH. Mr Hudgins.

Mr. DAVIS. Would you please state your full name for the reporter and for the record?

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER HUDGINS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, AND EDITOR, RURAL VIRGINIA

Mr. HUDGINS. Mr. Chairman, my name is Alexander Hudgins. I am executive secretary of the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives and editor of the statewide publication Rural Virginia.

I have filed a brief statement with your committee, which I trust will be placed in the record and if I may, I would appreciate having a moment to speak to that statement very briefly. Before I speak to that statement I would like to say there are also in the room, and here in support of the contentions of the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives, the assistant manager of the Virginia Electric Cooperative at Bowling Green, Mr. Lewis, and several of his members, and also Mr. Craig Chris, a director of that organization. We all hope the committee will act favorably on the project.

I would like to say to you that the John H. Kerr project at Buggs Island, as we call it in Virginia, has been supplying 12 of the 16 electrict cooperatives with electric energy. It has come through, as Mr. Robinson pointed out, a wheeling agreement with the Virginia Electrict & Power Co. We feel if the Salem Church project is approved that it will give us an additional supply. As of today there are several of our 12 electric cooperatives which have exhausted their part of the supply from the Buggs Island project and are presently buying additional current from the VEPCO at a price of 7.5 mills.

I believe Mr. Robinson pointed out, and the record will show, that the cost of current to the electric cooperatives from the Kerr project is slightly over 6.3 mills.

I would like to say to you as a result of hydroelectric projects the electric cooperatives have been able to get a supply of current at a much lower rate than was available to them prior to your approval of these hydroelectric projects. For example, before the John H. Kerr project was in operation in Virginia these same electric cooperatives were paying in excess of 1 cent for the same current that they now have today on a contract from the Vepco for supply above the John H. Kerr service at 7.5 mills.

We feel that this is a very important factor in the successful operation of our electric cooperatives. So much so that many of our electric cooperatives, I believe, would be operating in the red if it were not for that reduced cost which resulted from other hydroelectric projects which have been authorized. In that way we have been able to purchase additional current at a lower rate than we were paying prior to that time.

I think briefly, gentlemen, that is basically what my statement purports to say to you, and we trust you will give this bill your favorable approval. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Davis. Without objection the prepared statement of Mr. Hudgins will be made a part of the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

My name is Alexander Hudgins. I am executive secretary of the Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives and editor of the statewide publication, Rural Virginia.

The Virginia Association of Electric Cooperatives is composed of the 16 electric cooperatives in Virginia with a total membership of approximately 100,000 people.

Our association is very much interested in the development of the Salem Church project and we hope this committee will be able to give this project its support.

Hydropower has made the difference between operations in the black and in the red for many of the electric cooperatives in Virginia. For nearly 2 years now 12 of the 16 electric cooperatives have been receiving hydropower from the John H. Kerr project. Our electric cooperatives buy this power from the United States Government through the Southeastern Power Administration. It is "wheeled," or delivered, to the electric cooperatives over the high-voltage transmission lines of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

The cost of this electricity has averaged around 6½ mills per kilowatt-hour. Additional electricity is available to these cooperatives from the Virginia Electric & Power Co. at a 7.5-mill rate.

Five of the twelve electric cooperatives are now using more electricity from the John H. Kerr project than is available for them and have started purchasing additional current at the 7.5-mill rate from the Virginia Electric & Power Co.

If it is possible to have the Salem Church project developed at the 240-foot level, we understand from the Corps of Engineers that it will then be a feasible multipurpose project.

That portion of the electricity available from the project can be tied in with the output of the John H. Kerr project and will increase the availability of electricity for our rural systems in Virginia.

We know there are many phases of the multipurpose project which have support from various groups—and all of their statements tie in together to make sense and to warrant your support of the project.

We in the electric cooperatives feel that it is our place to confine our arguments to the power side of the project.

We need not take your time to elaborate on the shortage of power throughout the Nation. Nor is it necessary for us to point out the many advantages of hydropower in the electric industry.

We merely want to say to you that there is a healthy market in Virginia to the electric cooperatives as a result of the Salem Church project. We sincerely trust that you will give this project every consideration, and if the Corps of Engineers recognize it as a feasible project, which we are sure they do, you will be able to approve it and support it.

Mr. Davis. Mr. Becker, you have your usual question, do you not?

Mr. Becker. I am certainly in favor of the gentleman from Virginia, and I am pleased to take his word for it that he is interested in water for the people of Fredericksburg. He did not mention hydroelectric power. He might be for it, but he did not mention it. But you too, Mr. Hudgins, stress merely hydroelectric power.

There seems to be a little difference of opinion as to what is needed here; hydroelectric power and cheap rates, or the necessity for having drinking water and washing water and other benefits that water brings to people. You are interested merely in bringing cheap electric rates to the people in that area.

Mr. HUDGINS. I believe I also testified it will bring additional power as well as power at the rate we are now getting it for from John Kerr. I would like to say also in all of these projects that are multiple purpose there is more than just water for drainage and irrigation, and control of pollution, and recreation and flood control. Power is also a part of that same project.

Mr. BECKER. And no private power project can be built in that area by private companies that would give you the power at a rate in accordance with the taxes they have to pay because that brings it above the cost that the cooperatives can get it at without taxes.

Mr. HUDGINS. I cannot answer that except to say it has not been built.

Mr. BECKER. But they cannot compete with the 6.81 mills in building these plants.

Mr. HUDGINS. I am sure they will appear before you and give their reasons.

Mr. BECKER. That is all.

Mr. CRAMER. You indicated it would give you an additional supply, which is obvious. Is there any shortage now, or is there a shortage contemplated in the immediate future of either ordinary output or peak load output?

Mr. HUDGINS. That portion of Kerr Dam available to the electric cooperatives has already been exhausted by several cooperatives and they are presently buying additional current at 7.5 mills from VEPCO, above the amount which we are now receiving from Kerr Dam.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I understand from your answer that the supply is available but it is available from a private source rather than a public source?

Mr. HUDGINS. I think the answer is, correct, as of now.

Mr. DAVIS. As of now?

Mr. HUDGINS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. In your opinion when in the future will there be an actual public or private shortage?

Mr. HUDGINS. I believe that will be a question for an engineer to answer. I do not believe I can answer it to your satisfaction.

Mr. CRAMER. Are you disturbed about it, and do you feel it is in the near future?

Mr. HUDGINS We feel whenever we can add capacity that we are putting off the time when we will run into the problem you bring up. From the record as I see it all across the Nation the demand is greater than the supply, or is gradually reaching that point.

Mr. CRAMER. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have another witness, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We now have Francis B. Gouldman, who has been designated to speak for the proponents of the dam, and who is a representative in the State legislature from Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County.

Mr. DAVIS. We will be very glad to hear you, Mr. Gouldman.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS B. GOULDMAN, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA, FROM THE CITY OF FREDERICKSBURG AND THE COUNTY OF SPOTSYLVANIA

Mr. GOULDMAN. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Francis B. Gouldman, and my address is Fredericksburg, Va. I have the honor to represent the city of Fredericksburg and the county of Spotsylvania in the House of Delegates of the General Assembly of Virginia. My district is composed of approximately 23,000 people.

In addition to that I am speaking to you this morning on behalf of my neighbor, Stafford County, which has a population of approximately 12,000 people, aggregating about 35,000 people in all.

At the outset I wish to state emphatically and unequivocally that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the city of Fredericksburg and the adjoining counties of Spotsylvania and Stafford are wholeheartedly in favor of H. R. 192, introduced by the Honorable Howard W. Smith, Member of Congress, representing the Eighth District of Virginia.

For many years I have been intensely interested in the Salem Church project and I have made it my business to ascertain the feelings of my constituents with regard to this project. I can make the statement that I know of only one citizen in either the city or the two counties who is opposed to this project.

Fredericksburg has been visited by a number of floods. On two occasions within recent years, 1937 and 1942, large portions of Fredericksburg and the village of Falmouth, in Stafford County, have been inundated and devastated by floodwaters of the Rappahannock River.

The greatest flood of record occurred in October 1942. The damages to Fredericksburg alone exceeded $1 million. The city was without electric power, its water was contaminated, and its principal business establishments were inundated. Approximately 225 stores and other commercial and industrial establishments, and 180 homes, were directly affected.

Let me emphasize that should floods of the same size occur again, the damages would far exceed those reported for the previous floods because of the enhancement in property values and the improvements that have been made in our business district after it was damaged by the flood of 1942.

Traffic on U. S. Highway 1, which crosses the river at Fredericksburg and which is the most heavily traveled north-south highway in the United States, was blocked in both the 1937 and 1942 floods. The highway bridge carrying Route 3 across the river washed away in 1937.

The Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad, which also crosses the Rappahannock River at Fredericksburg, was unable to operate. The railroad bridge is used not only by the R. F. & P. but also by the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard Airline, with a present average of 65 trains per day, and during the war 131 trains.

Over these highway and railroad bridges passed many hundreds of thousands of troops and millions of tons of war material and implements of war. It is most important that these bridges be protected from destruction by flood and that traffic be enabled to move freely at all times.

Equally serious to our citizens are the droughts that have plagued us. Last summer the flow of the river was less than the consumption of water by the city and its nearby industries. The drought affected not only Fredericksburg. Many persons in the counties and business houses from as far away as Culpeper came to the city to get water.

The city was forced to severely restrict the consumption of water, and the Sylvania division of the American Viscose Corp. was in imminent danger of shutting down. This is our principal industry and cessation of its operations would work economic havoc throughout the area. Dr. George W. Low, Jr., manager of the Sylvania plant, is here and will later testify in detail concerning this situation.

During the past several summers the flow of the river has been so low that it has presented a serious health hazard. The subterranean water level in Spotsylvania County has drastically fallen. Three wells dug by the county last year were unable to furnish water to homes and business where it was sorely needed.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a note from Judge Smith stating that there are as many or more people outside in the corridor as there are in this room. He is a very fair man and asked this committee to seek larger quarters for this afternoon so that the opponents of this bill may be enabled to hear what is going on. I think that is a very fair move on your part, Judge. It is just like you.

We have asked one of our staff members to make that search and the announcement will be made when we do find a room. I thought I could catch Landon Mitchell there in time to make the announcement, so that he could hear it. Will somebody representing the opponents step outside and make an announcement that the afternoon session will be announced in a different room, just as soon as we find a room big enough to hold us all. I would like to have some idea as to how many are out there. I understand that there are as many outside as there are inside, if not more.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, and it is a very fine thing for us to do, but did we not agree each side would speak for an hour?

Mr. DAVIS. This side has used an hour and 26 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. We used up about 45 minutes speaking about procedure.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I think we will be fair. You are the last witness, as I understand it?

Mr. GOULDMAN. We have one more.

Mr. DAVIS. We will try to be fair about this and if the proponents get a little bit more time this afternoon I am sure that will be entirely satisfactory to the judge and all the others interested.

I have spoken to Judge Smith several times because he is the author of this bill, and we all know him to be a very fair man. That is the reason why I have mentioned his name several times in person.

Now will you proceed, please, sir?

Mr. GOULDMAN. In 1930 through a long period of drought the flow of the river was only 5 cubic feet per second, according to gagings

made by the Corps of Engineers, which flowage, were we able to gather every drop of it, would amount to only 3,240,000 gallons per day. The average daily consumption of water in Fredericksburg last year was 3,800,000 gallons; the maximum daily consumption was 6,500,000 gallons. It, therefore, can be seen that should we have a recurrence of the 1930 drought which, of course, is possible at any time, our citizens would not be able to secure enough water for ordinary daily uses.

The need for conservation of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural use is great. We are convinced that the dam not only will provide protection from flood but that it will conserve one of our most important natural resources. Likewise it will open up vast opportunities for healthful recreation for people far and near.

I am not an engineer and therefore I must confess that I am not a competent witness to testify concerning the details of electric-power generation at the proposed dam. We realize that, under the legislation adopted by the Congress, this type of dam must have a solid economic foundation, but for information on this subject I must defer to the Corps of Engineers, in whose ability I have great faith.

We, who have seen the city of Fredericksburg and the adjoining counties ravaged by flood and harassed by drought, know that our health, progress, and economic stability depend upon the construction of this dam. We need protection from floods. We know that existing industry has reached a practical limit of expansion, and that no large industry can come to this entire area, unless the situation that I have outlined is remedied. We know that our neighbors who farm in the nearby counties need water for agricultural purposes. We believe that the construction of the Salem Dam will benefit this entire section of Virginia.

I cannot impress too strongly upon you gentlemen the unanimity of the people of our community for Salem Dam. I wish to emphasize that this position favoring the dam has been taken not only by the people of the city of Fredericksburg and surrounding counties, but by the very people whose lands will be flooded, who of necessity will be deprived of their property by construction of the dam. Among such landowners are:

Thomas W. Kay and A. R. Pemberton, upon whose farms the dam will be constructed
Bernard A. Hall, who owns property stretching for more than a mile along the Rappahannock River in Spotsylvania County
May Brown, who owns more than a mile and half of shoreline along the Rapidan, in Orange and Culpeper Counties
Edwin A. Gibson
J. W. Masters, Inc
J. Clifford Hutt
E. O. McLane
Col. C. Wade LeGette
Ralph Covey
Harvey Janney
Fleet A. Burgess
A. T. Embrey, Jr.
Wm. C. Dickinson
E. O. Pates

And a number of others, whose holdings are in the area to be covered.

I am authorized to state that not only are they in favor of the project, but expressly ask that it be constructed. Some of these landowners are here now in this very room.

The governing bodies of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania, and Stafford have unanimously passed resolutions endorsing the project.

Almost every civic or fraternal organization has passed resolutions endorsing it, and attached to this statement is a partial list of 24 of these organizations. Without burdening you with the names of these organizations, I would like to point out that included among them are: ruritan clubs, parent-teachers associations, community improvement leagues, sportsmen's clubs, civic clubs, the chamber of commerce, labor unions, and volunteer rescue and fire companies. As I previously stated, it is endorsed and desired by every person I know of in the city and two counties, with the exception of just one.

We know that you gentlemen are pressed for time and we do not wish to burden you with any repetition. There are a number of people here as proponents of this bill and they have agreed that I speak in their behalf. Among them are:

Hon. Benjamin T. Pitts, State senator from the 26th Senatorial District, comprising the city of Fredericksburg and the counties of Spotsylvania, Orange, Louise, and Goochland
Hon. C. O'Conor Goolrick, former State senator from the 27th Senatorial District, former mayor and city attorney of the city of Fredericksburg, and chairman of the board of directors of Farmers & Merchants State Bank
Hon. C. M. Cowan, mayor of the city of Fredericksburg
Mr. L. J. Houston, Jr., city manager of Fredericksburg
Mr. F. Freeman Funk, assistant city manager
Mr. John D. Butzner, Jr., city attorney
Mr. C. A. Kramer, president of the Farmers & Merchants State Bank
Mr. William H. Kilian, manager of the G. & H. Manufacturing Co., one of our largest employers
Mr. John L. Fenlon, president of the chamber of commerce of the city

From the county of Stafford

Mr. George L. Gordon, Jr., commissioner of the revenue
Mr. Daniel M. Chichester, chairman of the electoral board
Mr. James Ahsby, Jr., director of Peoples Bank of Stafford

From the county of Spotsylvania

Mr. B. O. Carr, chairman of the board of supervisors
Mr. W. B. Wallace, a member of the board
Mr. T. Stokeley Coleman, Commonwealth's attorney
Mr. W. R. Dillard, county treasurer

We purposely made no effort to crowd in this room and the halls of this building a vast throng of people. However, had such a demonstration been advisable, I know that the people of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania, and Stafford Counties would have responded enthusiastically. There are present a number of citizens, either in their personal capacity or representing various organizations. I am authorized to speak on behalf of each and all of them and say to you that their position is exactly as I have herein stated and their only reason in not speaking to you this morning is to save you time and to avoid repetition.

I wish to express our appreciation, Mr. Chairman, to you and the committee for your courtesy and consideration in hearing us today. I leave you trusting that it will be your pleasure to report H. R. 192 favorably in order that the Salem Church Reservoir on the Rappahannock may be constructed.

Among the organizations that have endorsed the Salem Church Reservoir on the Rappahannock River are:

Roseville Community League
Stafford Lions Club
Falmouth Elementary Parent-Teachers Association
Stafford Elementary Parent-Teachers Association
Ferry Farms Civic Association
Enon Community League
Falmouth Volunteer Fire Department
Stafford Sportsmen's Club
Hartwood Improvement League
New Hope Parent-Teachers Association
Stafford Post No. 290 American Legion
Ramoth Community Improvement League
Stafford Ruritan Club
Chancellor Ruritan Club
Courtland Ruritan Club
Partlow Ruritan Club
Belmont Ruritan Club
Fredericksburg Rappahannock Chapter, Isaac Walton League
Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce
Order of Ahepa
Junior Chamber of Commerce
Veterans of Foreign Wars
Fredericksburg Rescue Squad
Local 713 Textile Workers of America.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, sir. Are there any questions from either side?

(No response.)

Mr. DAVIS. You would be in agreement with the proposed amendment suggested by Judge Smith to make it 240 feet?

Mr. GOULDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. One question. Your principal concern is water supply and flood control for your area. Is that right?

Mr. GOULDMAN. That is right, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Who is the last witness?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Dr. Low, plant manager of the Sylvania Corp. which operates a large factory there which I referred to.

Mr. DAVIS. A very important industry. Dr. Low, how long is your statement?

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE W. LOW, JR., PLANT MANAGER OF THE SYLVANIA DIVISION OF THE AMERICAN VISCOSE CORP., FREDERICKSBURG, VA.

Dr. LOW. Very brief, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. We have been unable to find space enough to house us all this afternoon. From what the previous witness stated, if the call had really gone out I do not believe there would be enough room in Washington. Dr. Low, I may interrupt you again in a moment if we get some information on a room big enough to hold the afternoon session. You may proceed now, sir.

Dr. LOW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is George W. Low, Jr., of Fredericksburg, Va. I am the plant manager of the Sylvania division plant of the American Viscose Corp., Spotsylvania County, Va.

This plant is the largest single cellophane plant in the world, and it produces in addition to cellophane, cellulose meat casings, cellulose bands for sealing bottle tops, textile finishes and plastics. Our products are shipped to over 7,000 customers in every State in the Union.

The plant is the largest single employer in any of the counties that will be affected by the Salem Church Dam. We have approximately 2,700 employees who come from the city of Fredericksburg and 12 counties of Northern Virginia, 10 of which are in the Rappahannock River Valley. Using standard ratio figures, this means that approximately 10,000 people are directly dependent upon the plant for their livelihood. Our weekly payroll is approximately $150,000, making an annual payroll of approximately $8 million, which represents a sizable portion of the economic activity of the entire area.

In the flood of 1942, the plant was seriously affected to the extent of operations being completely shut down for 4 days with the plant's water supply and the supply from the city completely cut off. Following this flood, the plant took every precaution to protect itself against future floods in order that operations might continue. However, every flood on the river has shown a large increase in volume over previous floods and we cannot be certain that should there be another major flood we could maintain operations.

Our manufacturing processes, being chemical in nature, require tremendous amounts of water, the daily requirements being approximately 30 million gallons. During the past 2 years we were in danger of another imminent cause of shutdown connected with the river—drought. During this period, flows in the river dropped to as low as 10,000 to 15,000 gallons per minute. When you consider that the city uses as much as 5,000 gallons per minute and the plant requires 25,000 gallons per minute, you can readily appreciate the serious effects of droughts. Moreover, in order to secure these large amounts of water, the minimum flow of the river should be 3 or 4 times that which is actually used by the city and the plant.

We were able to continue operations last summer only because we used the same water over and over again as it ebbed and flowed with the tide. However, there is a limit to the reuse of water in our manufacturing process, and in September of 1954 we had approached that limit. We seriously considered the use of rainmakers; in fact, arrangements had been made with a rainmaking company to conduct operations in the area. This emergency measure became unnecessary because of Hurricane Hazel, which swept through Virginia with heavy rains. Of course, we have no assurance of another hurricane coming to our aid, or of rainmaking being a solution to our problem, and our employees remain in constant danger of being without a means of livelihood over extended periods of time.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a very interesting statement. I hope your voice carries to the back of the room. Whether you are an opponent or a proponent, can you hear this statement back there? It is very illuminating to me realizing the importance of this plant, with an $8 million payroll per year and using 25,000 gallons of water per minute, whereas the city uses 5,000 gallons of water per minute.

Dr. LOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. And you are faced not only with a shortage of water, but with a flood condition.

Dr. LOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. There are two things there that could shut down your factory if some relief is not obtained.

Dr. LOW. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Pardon me for the interruption. I wish you would proceed and lift your voice just a little. I would like everyone in the room to hear it.

Dr. LOW. In order to maintain uninterrupted operations, we have expended over a million dollars on our water supply to secure an adequate amount of satisfactory water both in times of flood and in times of drought; but the flow of the river, which is the determining factor, is beyond our control. After studying the proposal of this dam, we believe that its construction will eliminate the dangers of both flood and drought.

We are wholeheartedly in favor of the Salem Church project. From extended discussion, I know that our officers and employees support it enthusiastically. We are certain that its construction will promote the economic stability of the thousands of families dependent on the plant for their livelihood, which in turn will have a beneficial effect on the economic life of the entire area.

We hope that you will favorably consider H. R. 192, which has been introduced by the Honorable Howard W. Smith. I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for the courtesy which you have extended to me today.

Mr. DAVIS. As I say again, I am sure that the entire committee will join me in expressing appreciation to you for a very fine and factual statement on the situation. Are there any questions from either side?

(No response.)

Mr. DAVIS. As much as we have tried, Judge, all we can promise for this afternoon is we will put some additional chairs in here for a session at 2 o'clock. In other words, we can let this hearing go over, but I am sure all who have come a distance will be inconvenienced. We had better try to finish it this afternoon. There are some here now who may not desire to return. The best way to do it is to meet in this room at 2 o'clock and we will have some additional chairs set up.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope those in attendance will make some effort to see that those who are in opposition will get a preference to hear their advocates speak this afternoon. As far as I know this concludes the case for the proponents. It seems to me in fairness the opponents ought to have an opportunity to be in here to listen to what is going on.

Mr. DAVIS. I gather you suggest that some of your proponents not return this afternoon.

We will adjourn then until 2 o'clock this afternoon, and meet in this room.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the subcommittee recessed until 2 p. m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. DAVIS. We will come to order, please. This morning some gentleman volunteered or made a statement that he was going to represent the opponents. Who is he?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is Mr. Norman Bailey, member of the house of delegates, from Orange County.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you come around, Mr. Bailey, and take charge now. We want to dispose of this in a couple of hours, if we can. We took 1 hour and 26 minutes this morning. Judge Smith said if you took longer this afternoon it would be all right, and it is certainly all right with this committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is not our desire to lengthen this hearing, although we do have several people who wish to be heard.

In order to save any fanfare and avoid any unnecessary talk, I am going to present at this time Mr. Miles Cary, of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., who will come forward at this time.

Mr. DAVIS. Give your full name and your title to the reporter.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a prepared statement, if you would like to have copies of it before I start.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. It may be that you can summarize or take the high spots, if it is a long statement, or quote verbatim such parts as you want to quote. That is merely a suggestion.

Mr. CARY. It is very short. It will only take about 5 minutes. I would prefer to read it.

Mr. DAVIS. That is quite all right

STATEMENT OF MILES CARY ON BEHALF OF VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER CO.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Miles Cary. I am operating manager of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va., an electric public utility serving the major part of Virginia and portions of northeastern North Carolina and east central West Virginia. Our service area includes Fredericksburg, Va., and the location of the proposed Salem Church project.

We are aware that damages have resulted in the Fredericksburg area from the 1937 and 1942 floods and also of the serious situation resulting from the drought in 1954, which threatened not only the Fredericksburg city water supply but also the operations of a large industrial plant. We also understand that this drought affected seriously the groundwater supply resulting in many dry wells. These are problems that deserve serious consideration and certainly the Virginia Electric & Power Co. does not oppose necessary measures for their solution.

The authorization for the Salem Church project contained in the Flood Control Act of 1946, which provides for a pond elevation to 220 feet, would be more than ample to take care of flood control, water supply, and flow regulation. The principal effect of raising the pond level would be to increase the amount of power the project could produce. Additional power is not needed in the area as Vepco already has an adequate supply—in fact, one of our most modern steam generating stations is located only about 30 miles away with a capacity that will be some 250,000 kilowatts in June of this year and over 1 million kilowatts ultimately.

The economic feasibility of the Salem Church project was doubtful, in our opinion, even based on 1943 construction costs and value of power, and, with the great increase in construction costs and only a

moderate increase in power values since that time, we are of the opinion that the project is even less feasible today.

We are here today only because we think it is our obligation to point out the fact that power values have not gone up in recent years in proportion to construction costs because of the much higher efficiency and larger size of steam units today, and that it is highly doubtful whether the capacity intended for Salem Church can be used on the area loads at the very low load factor contemplated for the project. Army engineers have stated that the dependable capacity and prime energy will be available from this project at an annual load factor of only 10 percent. That means that the dependable capacity could be used in a dry year, when it would be most needed, for only about three hours per day even if the minimum flow and water supply requirements are not increased over that assumed by the Army engineers.

May we point out also that the interests of a project built for peak power, low load-factor generation tend to conflict with the interests of a project built to regulate stream flow and for water supply, since the first requires release of large quantities of water for only a few hours at a time, while the second is better served by smaller but more uniform releases of water.

We have two suggestions to offer for your consideration. First, that before any change is made in the authorization for this project under the Flood Control Act of 1946, Federal agencies, including the Army Corps of Engineers, make up-to-date studies on the Salem Church project with careful study being given to the practicability and value of the hydroelectric portion of the project. Second, that consideration be given to a project serving purely the purposes of flood control, water supply, and river regulation.

I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of presenting our views at this hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to make an additional statement to clarify something that was said this morning in regard to the land that our company owns in the river valley. I think it was included in this table that is on the upper lefthand corner of the map there. I think the statement was made that the wooded lands are largely owned by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. I would like to state that the land we own is largely wooded, but amounts to only about 4,900 acres and was acquired many years ago when only low dams were contemplated, so that land is in the lower reaches of the river and would be flooded by almost any dam at any height and is not affected in any way by the increase in the height of the dam.

Mr. DAVIS. Any questions on my right?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Army engineers must find a project feasible before they can proceed with it, and the various factors that the witness has pointed out are the very things to take into account. So we will get that report.

Mr. CARY. We just want to recommend that they take that into account in a practical, modern, up-to-date way.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I assume they will do it that way.

Mr. CARY. Well, it has not been done yet.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Apparently they did with the 220-foot dam, because they found it was not feasible.

Mr. CARY. That is correct. They did find it not feasible.

Mr. DAVIS. Any other questions?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. In your last paragraph you state that you are for the flood-control project and the necessity for water in that area.

Mr. CARY. We certainly have no objection to it. We have not gone into it. We know there is a serious situation that exists there that probably something ought to be done about.

Mr. BECKER. I am trying to clarify both sides. The water is needed for those people.

Mr. CARY. It certainly is.

Mr. BECKER. So something has to be done. Now, the question of whether hydroelectric power will be added is another question. You said in your statement your plant will be providing 250,000 kilowatt-hours, is that correct?

Mr. CARY. Kilowatts of capacity.

Mr. BECKER. Kilowatts of capacity—in June of this year. And that would bring it to over a total of 1 million kilowatts ultimately. When is "ultimately?"

Mr. CARY. Whenever it is needed; whenever the needs of that area require additional capacity. The plant has ample facilities, land and water—everything is there. That is on the Potomac River, by the way. And that plant can be expanded as needed to something over 1 million kilowatts.

Mr. BECKER. What are you using in your steam plants—coal or oil?

Mr. CARY. At the present time we are using coal; but we can use either oil or coal.

Mr. BECKER. Well, I was a little bit interested in steam plants from the standpoint of the use of coal. I like to keep the coal mines going and the workers working. That is why I am interested in steam plants as one issue.

The second issue is the comparative costs of the hydroelectric power developed through the Government processes and the cost of it as developed through the private processes, and the difference in the taxes paid by one and by the other. I asked the other gentleman this morning, with the difference in rate of 6.81 of the Government and the rate of 7.5 that you are charging, would be in taxes that a private company paid.

Mr. CARY. I think it would have a tremendous effect. We pay about 20 percent of our gross revenue in all taxes. That was a total of about $19 million in the year 1954.

Mr. BECKER. In other words, you pay $19 million in taxes—your company.

Mr. CARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. How much do the cooperatives pay?

Mr. CARY. I don't know, but I imagine the statement made this morning is correct, that they do not pay any Federal income taxes. They do pay some local taxes.

Mr. BECKER. So you pay $19 million with a difference of rate of 6.81 and 7.5. That is about a quarter of a cent, isn't it?

Mr. CARY. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. BECKER. Your company, through that quarter of a cent, pays $19 million in taxes—just in this one company.

Mr. CARY. That is right—one company.

Mr. BECKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. JONES. May I ask a question. Is that the reason that you are here testifying—the fact that you are opposing this on the grounds that the Virginia Electric & Power Co. pays Federal income taxes?

Mr. CARY. No, I wouldn't say that was really the reason we are here.

Mr. JONES. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Call your next witness, please, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. The next gentleman is a representative of the Southern Railroad—Mr. T. M. von Sprecken.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to present a statement on behalf of the Southern Railway Co. in connection with this hearing on House bill 192.

STATEMENT OF T. M. von SPRECKEN, ON BEHALF OF SOUTHERN RAILWAY CO.

My name is T. M. von Sprecken.

I am assistant to chief engineer (system), Southern Railway Co., now residing in Arlington County, Va.

I am a graduate of the University of Georgia, engineering school, class of 1914, with degree of B. S. in civil engineering.

I am a registered engineer in three States, including Virginia, and a member of a number of engineering societies and associations, including American Society of Civil Engineers, American Railway Engineering Association, American Society for Testing Materials and a number of others.

I have been in the engineering department of the Southern Railway Co. or its subsidiaries since 1914, with the exception of time spent in the air service during World War I, and 3 years with the United States Railroad Administration. I have been familiar with the Washington Division and the territory around Remington since 1915. I was chief engineer maintenance of way and structures in 1946 and 1947 prior to my appointment to my present position.

Southern Railway's interest in the bill H. R. 192 under consideration is because it is apprehensive that a dam with a pool level as proposed will increase the chances of flooding its tracks in the vicinity of Remington, Va. These tracks were covered by 2 to 3 feet of water in 1942 and traffic stopped for 12 hours. We fear that floods of that magnitude with a full pool behind the proposed dam will cause a similar flood to cover longer stretches of track with deeper water and that smaller floods will cover our tracks which they would not do from natural causes without the dam and pool. Water over the tracks is much more serious now than it was in 1942. In 1942 practically all of our motive power was steam operated and this type of power can be operated through several feet of water after careful check has determined that the roadbed and track are safe. On the other hand, the diesel-electric power now used cannot be operated with any water over the rail. (The water splashes into the traction motors.)

Any interruption to traffic is serious to the railroad and to interstate commerce. The Rappahannock River crosses the main double track line of the Washington division of the Southern near Remington, Va., at milepost 56.8 (measured from Washington). This is one of our heaviest traveled divisions and carries all of the Washington traffic of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. in addition to all of the

traffic funneled into it by Southern Railway Co. This traffc amounts to some 35 million gross tons per year or an average of over 100,000 gross tons per day.

We feel there is need for a complete investigation by independent engineers to determine whether the railroad will be adversely affected by the proposed dam. The present authorization limits the height of the power pool to 220 feet above mean sea level and we did not oppose that. The present plan plate II, file No. B–425–103–3 proposed by the United States Engineer Office in 1943 shows that a 150,000 cubic feet per second flood with an elevation of the pool at the dam of 247.8 would put the water several feet over the tracks at Remington. It also shows the maximum power pool at elevation 240.0 above mean sea level. the flood-control pool elevation at 252.8 feet above mean sea level and a maximum water surface elevation at 257.0 above mean sea level. The effect on the railroad of a flood of the magnitude of the 1942 flood with the pool at maximum elevation of 257.0 above mean sea level is not shown but it seems highly possible that such a flood at such a time would create a water level at Remington considerably higher than would be caused by natural flow without the dam. The maximum water level shown is 9.2 feet higher than that on which the backwater curve at Remington was computed. These figures give us grave apprehension as to the effect on the railroad as it is now proposed to remove the limitation on the height of the pool level imposed by existing authorization. The railway company has employed an independent hydraulic engineer consultant to advise it as to how it will be affected. These studies are not complete. The Southern Railway Co. wishes the committee to understand its problem. The committee will be advised of the results of the study as quickly as possible. The Southern Railway Co. requests that it be permitted to present such facts as it may develop before final action is taken on this bill.

Pending the study by independent, competent and impartial engineers, the Southern Railway opposes passage of this bill (H. R. 192) which will remove the present limitation on the maximum height of the power pool.

That completes my statement sir. I wish to thank you for the opportunity of attending.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, sir. Any questions?

Mr. DEMPSEY. How far is the dam located from your railroad tracks?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. The dam is downstream, but the normal power pool of 240 elevation shown would put it within about 3 miles of our track.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The dam is below your track?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes sir.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you think that the control of the water in the area covered would affect your railroad?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. With that dam in place and a pool as shown on the engineers' plans, which are not limited to 240.0, which is the normal pool, and that is the figure they have all been using—the engineers' plan shows water much higher than the normal pool—and with the dam in place and a pool at that level, with a flood the size of the 1942 or even a lesser flood, we think it may back water up on our tracks and damage us.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I find that at times less water could create greater damage, provided that the silt has built up your channel, which I find in the West to be the case. Where there is no channel existing, practically, in those instances we do not need quite as much precipitation as we ordinarily would if we had a deep channel. You are right on the channel of this river, are you?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. We cross the Rappahannock River at the town of Remington.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is 3 miles above the dam?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir; that is more than 3 miles above the dam. That is 3 miles above where the 240 elevation of the pool runs out. That river, at that point, is a rocky stream. There is no silt right there.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you have any objection if there were a 240-foot limitation placed in lieu of a 220-foot limitation?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I would like to state that we would like to have our engineer check into that a little closer before we commit ourselves on that point.

Mr. THOMPSON. But you have not developed that yet.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions. The testimony you gave today I believe you based on the fact that you thought the water would do damage to your track if it reached the level of 247.8; is that correct, sir?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. The 247.8 is the elevation of the pool at the dam on which the engineers computed that the backwater curve would not be higher than the natural flow at our tracks. But it runs right up to the track.

Mr. ROGERS. At that level?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. At that level. Now, if you had a flood when the pool was high, and they show a maximum pool level on that drawing of 9.2 feet above that level, we are apprehensive that we would get a good deal of that 9.2 feet additional water over our tracks.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, where did those figures come from?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. The Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ROGERS. I mean in figuring the backflow on the tracks; are those your own figures?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. The Corps of Engineers figured that.

Mr. ROGERS. So your people have not made any independent study of this at all?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. We are making it now.

Mr. ROGERS. So the testimony you have given is based on what you have received from the engineers?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. And that is not based on a level of 240 as is proposed in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir. The 240 proposed in the bill is what is called the normal pool, but they provide for storage above that level for flood.

Mr. ROGERS. I mean if this bill provides that they will not have any more than a level of 240?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. If they provided it would be a maximum power pool of 240, it would be much safer for the Southern Railway.

Mr. ROGERS. I see—because you feel that the water does not touch your track, according to the information you have at hand, until it reaches 247.8.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Well, it doesn't reach our track until it is a good deal higher than that. Our rail is at 276.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. If the dam, as eventually constructed, showed that the pool or any normal expectancy of the size of the pool would damage your track or facilities, would not the Southern Railway be compensated for it?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. That is always a question, sir. We would try to get compensated.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. From your previous experience, when such construction of Government facilities has been made, has not the Southern Railway been compensated?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Sir, in recent years; yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. All right. Now, are there not some railroads down around Fredericksburg.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. They have extensive facilities there. If there were a flood today that hit that area and those railroads suffered damage, they would be compensated by the Government, would they not?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I doubt if they would, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In other words, you want to avoid some damage being done to your facilities for which you would get reasonable compensation, but you are willing for your competitive lines to be subject to the threat of a disastrous flood for which they would get no compensation.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir; I would not say so.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It amounts to that position.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. We are not anxious for anyone to get damaged by any flood, either disastrous or small. We hope they do not have one.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. But you are opposing flood protection for these other lines; are you not?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir. They had flood protection for these lines, if you will pardon me, sir, when they proposed the elevation of the pool level at 220. That is our position. Now, when you raise it to 240, with these other figures of possible elevations of the pool above the 240, we are apprehensive that we will be damaged. We wish to have the opportunity to present findings of our hydraulic engineer as soon as we can work the figures out.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentleman yield. I think that our colleague, Judge Smith, has indicated already before the committee that he would favor a definite limitation of 240 feet, a height which you say probably would not trouble you.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I would rather believe that if he would make that the maximum pool level, it probably would not. But I am not prepared to make that statement without going into it.

Mr. ROGERS. How long will it take your people to prepare that information?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I would say that we could complete that study within a month.

Mr. ROGERS. You cannot do it before then?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Becker.

Mr. BECKER. As I understood you, you said you were testifying for what railroad?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Southern Railway Co.

Mr. BECKER. And that is the only one you are interested in this particular picture.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. That is correct, sir, primarily.

Mr. BECKER. I did not hear you say anything in your testimony about compensation for damages to the roadbed. I understood you to say in your statement that you were concerned about the flow of traffic and commerce over the railroads.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. That it would be an economic loss to the whole area and everybody concerned in transportation; is that true?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. I think that was the gist of it.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. That is what I was after.

Mr. BECKER. It was not a question of being compensated for any roadbed loss. I wanted to clear that up. Your testimony did not affect any other railroad, whether they had a compensatory loss or not.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir.

Mr. BECKER. I did not hear anything in your statement about that. I just wanted to clarify the record.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I might state that we have very friendly relations with the R. F. & P., which is the railroad at Fredericksburg. We had correspondence with R. F. & P. about this matter.

Mr. BECKER. One other question was asked that I would like to clear up. Your statement, I believe, was to the effect that even with 240 feet, while you have no factual information, there is a possibility that with the normal pool, when it goes above that normal, there would then be a possibility of flooding over the railroad right-of-way.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will the gentleman yield? I doubt if there would be loss in commerce or movement of tonnage or even physical loss to the railroad, because from my experience and what I have seen, the engineers anticipate these things on the construction of a certain level dam and the facilities are moved to a point where there is no danger prior to the opening of the project. Is that not so, sir?

Mr. BECKER. That I do not know. You will have to ask the witness the question.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. If you will pardon me, I would say if we can convince the Army engineers that are in charge of the project that we would be damaged, I believe they would do something to eliminate the damage. But as far as I know, they have not admitted that we would be damaged at all or have any chance of being damaged.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think, sir, they have not made a survey on the dam. They would need a new survey.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Mr. Chairman, there are two points I could clarify. The first is this point of the railroad relocation. We have not completed the study of a high-level dam, so naturally we cannot actu-

ally verify these preliminary figures that were given to you. In accordance with our regular practice, if we found that the railroad was menaced by the backwater levels of the project, we would be required and would raise the railroad so that it would not be adversely affected.

There is another point I think I ought to mention, and that is this question of maximum versus normal elevation. All of the discussion this morning revolved around the normal elevation of the dam as 220 or 240. The lower dam, with a normal elevation of 220, has a maximum elevation, with flood control in it, of 240, and the higher elevation of the dam referred to as 240 actually has a maximum flood-control elevation of over 253. So there is a danger of confusion in all of these discussions about the two dams as regards normal elevation. In both cases there is a flood-control elevation which is above normal elevation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the colonel one question?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Colonel, in your previous survey, where you were concerned with the dam at 240, did you not go into any of these problems? Do you have any of that information?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, was not the railroad there 10 years ago?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Can you not tell us now what the situation is on the basis of that study?

Colonel WHIPPLE. The answer at that time, sir, was that with the 240 elevation normal pool, which would be at elevation 253 flood-control pool at the dam, they considered that there would be no material increase in height which would affect the railroad. However, that was a matter that we always recheck during final design of the project, and until you get into the final design, you do not usually know if there is an effect.

Mr. ROGERS. But it will probably be the same; will not not?

Colonel WHIPPLE. I think the probably is with extreme floods there would be some adverse effect.

Mr. ROGERS. But you would take that into consideration in any survey you would make now.

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes, sir, we would.

Mr. DAVIS. I am inclined to think that, if necessary to ask Colonel Whipple further questions, we will wait until another session. That is just an observation. If the committee agrees with me, we will follow that procedure. Then we can keep the continuity.

Are there any other questions on this side?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have a question. From the background you gave the committee, on your qualifications, you probably have followed this flood control question quite a good deal in that area. Are you aware of the legislation passed in the 83d Congress that had to do with flood control, what we in Iowa call nailing the raindrop, flood control back in the hills?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I am not familiar with that, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There was some that was quite significant. I think that ought to be taken into account and that we see whether or not there is any relationship between the reduction of flood possibilities at Fredericksburg with the completion of that project or those ideas as developed in that legislation.

Now, I have one other point. As an engineer, could you tell us what the difference is in cost to the Government of a multipurpose dam and one for just flood control, percentagewise or in dollars, in this instance.

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. No, sir, I would not be able to be qualified on a dam. My experience has been entirely confined to railroads. I am not qualified as a hydraulic or dam expert.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, the 220 project would take care of the flood control and the water facilities for Fredericksburg or would it not?

Mr. VON SPRECKEN. I am not prepared to state. In 1946 they thought it would be.

Mr. DAVIS. Any other questions? If not, thank you very much, sir.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, may I correct a mathematical error in the record made a few minutes ago. In answer to Mr. Becker's question where he stated the difference between the Government rate and our rate was a quarter of a cent, it should be 0.7 of a mill, instead of a quarter of a cent.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, sir. Now, who is the next witness.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to call Mr. Marvin Bates, who represents several Ruritan Clubs in Culpeper County and who is assistant manager of the Culpeper Farmers Cooperative.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Marvin Bates, representing the Ruritan Clubs of the county and the farmers. I have with me a prepared statement which I would like to present. It is short, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read it.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, sir.

STATEMENT OF MARVIN BATES ON BEHALF OF SEVERAL RURITAN CLUBS IN CULPEPER COUNTY

Mr. BATES. As chairman of a joint committee representing Culpeper, Orange, and Fauquier Counties, appointed at a public meeting held in Culpeper, Va., March 8, 1955, I have been authorized to protest the raising of the proposed Salem Church Reservoir Dam on the Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg, Va., above elevation 220 feet (power-pool level) as now fixed by the Flood Control Act of 1946, on the following grounds:

(1) That the raising of the proposed dam to elevation 240 feet as contemplated by H. R. 192, would make it necessary for the Federal Government to acquire extensive areas of rich bottomland bordering the Rapidan and Rappahannock Rivers in the counties mentioned above and also involve the reconstruction of roads, bridges, and other improvements for reservoir purposes;

(2) That the removal of such highly productive areas from cultivation would seriously reduce the income of the farmers concerned and thus leave most of the valuable farms affected uneconomical to operate;

(3) That the reduction in areas cultivated would furthermore seriously reduce the collection of land taxes in these counties and also affect business generally without any compensating benefits;

(4) That we have been reliably informed that there exists no shortage of power in the Fredericksburg area at this time and that the

completion of a 100,000 kilowatt coal-burning plant by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. near Quantico, Va., in the near future will supply the increasing demand for power in the northern part of Virginia;

(5) That it appears that the renewed interest of the Fredericksburg community in the Salem Church Dam is primarily to augment its water supply in view of the shortage of water experienced by that community during the droughts of 1953 and 1954;

(6) That it still appears that a dam with crest elevation of 220 feet or lower would provide effective flood protection for the city of Fredericksburg in accordance with the authority originally granted by Congress for making the investigation of this project. (See your resolution adopted November 24, 1942.)

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this statement made a part of the record of this hearing.

Mr. DAVIS. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, these 3 Ruritan Clubs have 121 members. This is a civic organization, made up of businessmen and farmers. They have passed resolutions in their membership opposing the raising of the elevation from 220 to 240 feet. These clubs reached that decision after referring to the Army engineers and other reliable sources of information.

Thank you.

Mr. DAVIS. How many property owners do you think would be affected in the inundation of the necessary acres to bring it to the 240-foot elevation.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer that in this way. We have divided up our position and we have other speakers following that I think have that information. I do not have it right at the moment. I could give you an estimate, which I think would be of little value. However, I believe a speaker to follow me will be able to answer that question, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. That is quite all right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What is the specific objection to this by the people that you represent?

Mr. BATES. We object, sir, to inundating these valuable farmlands of Culpeper County.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is what I wanted to find out. That is what the chairman asked you about.

Mr. BATES. He asked me the number of farmers, sir.

Mr. DEMPSEY. How many acres would be affected in the area you are talking about?

Mr. BATES. I assume that the figure that was given by Judge Smith this morning is correct, sir, on the number of acres.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That was about 2,000 acres in the entire area.

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Would all that be in your area?

Mr. BATES. No, sir; all of it would not be.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What would be in your area?

Mr. BATES. For that, too, I would have to refer to a future speaker, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you realize that some of this water would be used for irrigation?

Mr. BATES. The best information that we have, sir, is that irrigation possibilities, as far as Culpeper County is concerned, would be practically nil; that during the summer, when we need irrigation, the water level would be so low that we would not be able to reach it. That is the best information we have available, sir. I state that from the standpoint of Culpeper County.

Mr. DEMPSEY. So even if the dam did impound certain waters, you would not get any benefit from it?

Mr. BATES. No, sir; we would not.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have a question. At the time that the people you represent indicated that they would not approve a dam of any greater height than 220 feet, were they aware that the Engineers had declared a 220-foot dam would not be feasible and probably would not be constructed?

Mr. BATES. They were, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is, they would rather have no dam at all.

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. Would the gentleman yield just a moment. I hope that sometime we can go into the effects of the 220 and 240 dam as to whether the necessity is for water or electric power.

Mr. DAVIS. Those resolutions were passed recently?

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Very recently?

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Based on the very latest information you had at hand.

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Let's have the next witness.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to call Mr. Connor Yates, member of the board of supervisors of Culpeper County.

STATEMENT OF CONNOR YATES, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CULPEPER COUNTY

Mr. YATES. My name is Connor Yates and I am on the board of supervisors of Culpeper County. There is a resolution of the board of supervisors opposing the dam.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, we will put that opposition on the record. You have no further statement to make?

Mr. YATES. No, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask the witness how many residents there are in Culpeper County.

Mr. YATES. I don't know.

Mr. ROGERS. Can you give us an approximate number.

Mr. YATES. About 13,000 or 14,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Mr. BUSH. Was this a unanimous resolution of the board?

Mr. YATES. Yes, sir—five members.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Thank you.

Who is the next witness?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. F. D. Griffith, representing the Culpeper County Farm Bureau.

STATEMENT OF F. D. GRIFFITH, DAIRY FARMER, REPRESENTING CULPEPER COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I am F. D. Griffith, a dairy farmer. I represent the Culpeper County Farm Bureau. I wrote what I have to say, so I will stick close to the subject and take very little time.

It is interesting to note that large industries and Government installations are seemingly placed on good grades of land or on locations adjacent to them. The reason might well be that good land has been able to support the concentration of population in these areas. We feel that it is necessary to keep in production all good land. The population is increasing rapidly and will continue to do so. The acres of good land are not increasing. So it is in the best interests of all to conserve what we have. We do not feel that the best interests of all would be served by inundating the good, productive bottom lands of our county. We are not being selfish about it; only realistic.

Pricewise, good land costs money, and you just cannot go out and buy it close by. After all, the buildings and the equipment are located to advantage in their present setting. When you take away the land, you have destroyed the usefulness of the homestead.

There was a time when persons could move to another farm. That time has passed. Good land is tightly held and high in price, and there is only so much of it. The cost of relocating these farms in the same relative position as now would be much more than has been allotted. Any other method of settlement would be confiscatory.

I believe we should be very interested in conserving our good land and our good people who live on it.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a crackerjack statement, I want you to know. It is logical as can be—without reference to whether this project should be approved or not approved, whether this bill should be approved or not approved, you are reasoning soundly on the question of good land and the productivity of land and the closeness of land and the value of land. Your statement especially appealed to me, although I am from the city, that good land is not available today to the same extent it was formerly, in spite of the fact that the population is increasing at the rate of about 3 million a year.

Are there any questions?

Mr. THOMPSON. I agree that good land is hard to find. I would like to ask, sir, if this land was harmed to any extent by the drought that existed previously.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, you know that all land was harmed by the drought. You cannot grow a crop without water.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you think that the saving of this land would be proper in the face of maybe thousands of acres elsewhere being protected by proper conservation practices having to do with the building of dams?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Well, I cannot see that that dam would help us any, and I don't know as it is going to help those below, as far as land is concerned. When you get down below Fredericksburg, you get into the tidewater. That is able to absorb a lot of water—it just spreads out. So when you come up there and cover our good land with water, then it is just like reaching down in our pocket and taking money out.

Mr. DAVIS. Did you have some land inundated yourself?

Mr. GRIFFITH. The closest it comes to me is about 2 miles. But I am thinking if it backs up that 2 miles and then we get a freshet, what is going to happen?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to agree with our distinguished chairman when he says that you are a splendid witness here and that you have given fine testimony. I imagine you could probably answer the question that I asked of the previous witness relative to the Conservation Act passed under Public Law 566 in the 83d Congress. Can you tell us whether there is any relationship between that and the flood problem at Fredericksburg?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Well, I don't know. You speak of a bill with which I am not familiar.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is designed to keep the water on the land.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is what we are doing. I believe there is a witness to follow me that will tell you that the conservation practices we are following now are conserving the water. The number of ponds and the strip cropping and the contour cropping we are following is saving water. There is no runoff like it used to be. I believe there will be somebody to tell you about that. But that is my observation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, could I ask this question: You represent the farm bureau for one of the counties involved; is that right?

Mr. GRIFFITH. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. BUSH. Do you know whether there are other farm bureaus below the dam that are for this project or are all the farm bureaus in the area opposed to it?

Mr. GRIFFITH. I represent the Culpeper County Farm Bureau, no other.

Mr. BUSH. I realize that. But do you know the position of the farm bureaus of the counties downstream from the dam?

Mr. GRIFFITH. No; I do not.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ryland Heflin, from Stafford County. I happen to represent the Stafford County Farm Bureau, and they are for it. I was sent here today for that purpose. That is for the record.

Mr. DAVIS. Call your next witness, Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Ward H. Hurt, a dairy farmer in Culpeper County who will probably be affected more by this dam than any other man along the river. He is also director of the Culpeper National Bank.

STATEMENT OF WARD H. HURT, DAIRY FARMER AND DIRECTOR OF THE CULPEPER NATIONAL BANK

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am W. H. Hurt from Culpeper. I am a dairyman. I am speaking, as Mr. Bailey says, from a personal standpoint, because in raising the dam level from 220 to 240, it would flood a lot of our good valuable land that Mr. Griffith just told you about, and we cannot replace it.

Of course, I expect it is in some of your minds, and it has been in our minds, that this land will be appraised and paid for by the Government. That is part of the story. Sometime recently I was in Alexandria on a Federal jury, and there were 3,000 cases on the docket there where the land had been confiscated, but the landowners did not

agree to the value that had been set upon it, and therefore they were in court to see if they could settle for the proper value.

We have a lot of acres that would be flooded, and these arcres are our most valuable land. To bring out that point, last year that was the only land that we made any corn on at all. Now, you can realize that if you have got 50 or 100 acres of land that will produce in a drought year like that, how much value it is to you.

Go back to 1935. We had one little strip of river bottom there that produced the seed corn for the whole county. That is practically all the corn that was made. So it is very valuable land.

Another point I would like to bring out is this. If you make this 240, the flood area would be 13 feet higher, which would be 253. Not only would it flood so much land, but it would go up our ravines and little valleys. In my case, for instance, I would not be able to get to the highway, and my farm would be cut into about four different parcels.

So it would certainly cause a great handicap to us.

Now, to hit the political angle a little bit—you all have so much to follow in your own districts, you certainly cannot follow the situation all over the United States. But my good friend Judge Smith is over here, and I am for him; whether his bill goes through or not, I am for him. He has been a friend of ours and is still a friend.

But you know, his district was enlarged, and Fredericksburg was taken in. Well, besides that, there was a very charming and sparkling opponent came out in opposition last year. Well, anybody would have to do something to get those fellows to vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES. You had better not talk too much—we might help him. [Laughter.]

Mr. HURT. When this bill was up, Judge Smith helped us get this dam from 240 to 220. But of course it is a different situation now. And we appreciate that. We are his friends up in Culpeper and we are for him.

Now, to get back to Fredericksburg, we have a lot of good friends there, a lot of good people down there. And we will grant you that they have a little trouble with floods. But do you know how many floods they mention—2; 1 in '37 and 1 in '42.

This plant down there they say is the lifeblood to that town, and I will grant you that is more or less true. But they have been operating since 1930, and that is 25 years ago, and they haven't closed down yet. They didn't close down last year. We had the drought in '53, '54, and some in '52. And the river still kept them running.

Now, this bill proposes to keep them running regardless of drought. But it also proposes to put us out of business today and forever. And if we don't have any more severe droughts than 2 or 3 years ago, they are going to operate. It is not going to bother them.

Of course, it is a question for you to decide, but why should Uncle Sam go down there to protect them and guarantee they are going to have plenty of water. There is the question of protecting them versus running us off our farms. Some of us have been there for five generations. Of course, to some that doesn't matter too much, but it is something.

But that reminds me of a little story. A mother had a little boy just starting in to school, and being an only child he was the apple of her eye. She said to the teacher "Now, you may have to correct him,

but he is a very timid little boy. If you do have to correct him, don't slap him—slap the boy next to him. That will stop him." [Laughter.]

I know you will take into consideration all this good land you are going to flood to help those people in Fredericksburg. But I hope you can help them out with the 220.

Mr. DAVIS. Any questions from either side. Thank you very much, Mr. Hurt, for a fine statement.

Mr. BAILEY. The next witness is Mr. Walter B. Potter, director of the Culpeper Chamber of Commerce and editor of the Culpeper Star Exponent.

STATEMENT OF WALTER B. POTTER, DIRECTOR, CULPEPER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND EDITOR OF THE CULPEPER STAR EXPONENT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I have here a resolution passed by the board of directors of our chamber of commerce opposing the raising of the dam. In general, this is quite similar to Mr. Hurt's statement, so I will not read it, but will turn it over to the reporter.

Mr. DAVIS. It shall be incorporated in the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

Whereas H. R. 192 would amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress known as the Flood Control Act, approved July 24, 1946, by authorizing the raising of the proposed Salem Church Reservoir Dam from an elevation of 220 feet (reservoir pool level) to an elevation of 240 feet, thus making it necessary for the Government to acquire extensive areas of rich bottom land on the Rapidan and Rappahannock Rivers in Culpeper County;

Whereas the loss of such highly productive farm areas would substantially reduce the agricultural income of many farmers and would cause many valuable farms to be uneconomical and further it would substantially lessen the land value of this county without any offsetting benefits accruing to this county;

Whereas it appears that a dam of the crest level of 220 feet or less would provide a sufficient water supply for the city of Fredericksburg and sufficient flood protection for the city of Fredericksburg and other communities on the lower Rappahannock River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Culpeper Chamber of Commerce through its board of directors, That the elevation of the proposed Salem Church Dam should not exceed 220 feet as now provided by the present law and that copies of this resolution be sent to our Representative and Senators in the Congress and to the Governor of Virginia.

Mr. POTTER. I should like to state I have received more letters to the editor because of this dam problem than on any other subject that has come up in the almost 5 years I have been publishing this paper in Culpeper County. It has aroused keen interest in our county, both from the standpoint of the farmers there, who will be affected, and their friends in the town of Culpeper.

We are in the unpleasant position here of seeming to deny to our neighbors to the east water which they need. We have had a great need for water ourselves last summer and can appreciate that. We had to dig a well to get the water. We now have plenty of water from that well. We realize that such a project probably would not be feasible for Fredericksburg, because you cannot always get sufficient water from wells in such quantities. However, we believe that a dam can be built that will meet their need for water and that will take care

of their flood-control requirements without permanently flooding this rich bottom land in our county.

As has been pointed out, you just cannot make this bottom land. We only have three rivers in the county—the Hazel River, the Rappahannock and the Rapidan—of appreciable size, which means that there is very little bottom land in this county. And we will be losing the most extensive bottom land along the Rapidan River through this project.

These farmers that lose their bottom land and want to relocate won't be able to relocate in the county. They will have to go out of the county if they are going to get any more bottom land, because it just is not there. We don't want to lose these people from our county, because they are our neighbors and our friends. We don't like to see them run away.

We feel that this problem can be settled in some other manner than through causing their relocation.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a fine statement. Are there any questions?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am being impressed more all the time with the land to be inundated and taken out of cultivation on this project. Can you tell us what percent of the land in Culpeper County that would represent, the good grade A land.

Mr. POTTER. I could not say what percent it would be, no, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It is a total of 2,000 acres.

Mr. POTTER. That is a figure that is given by the engineers—2,000 additional acres of agricultural land, primarily bottom land. That is between the 20 and 40 feet.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Everybody that has come here has said they are all for the 20. How do you stand on that? Are you for the 20?

Mr. POTTER. Personally, I don't think that even a 220-foot dam would be necessary to meet the requirements of Fredericksburg. I would like to see them taken care of at some level that would take care of that, without necessarily going into the problem of producing power, which we don't seem to need, and power seems to be the reason for going higher.

Mr. BECKER. In other words, as I understand you, sir, and Mr. Hurt and Mr. Griffith, you are all for helping the people who need help.

Mr. POTTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. You have taken a philosophical attitude that it is not necessary to hurt your people in order to help the people of Fredericksburg get water. Therefore, you think a lower dam consistent to provide the necessary water for the people that need it can be constructed without being sufficient to inundate the land in your area, is that correct?

Mr. POTTER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. BECKER. I am for that also.

Mr. DAVIS. You do not think there is a real shortage of power in that area at the moment?

Mr. POTTER. No one has indicated there is a shortage, sir, among the electrical people.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. We next have Mr. Earl Hawkins, a dairy farmer from Culpeper County.

STATEMENT OF EARL HAWKINS, DAIRY FARMER, CULPEPER COUNTY

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Earl Hawkins, a dairy farmer. I haven't got a prepared statement. In fact, I was hoping there would be enough to talk without me. But I live down near the Rapidan River, between Brooks Run and Potato Run. There are four dairy farms in that section that ship milk to Washington. And the four dairy farms have a good many acres in corn, hay land, and pasture.

The dam at 220 doesn't seem to affect as much good bottom land in Culpepper County as the 240. The 240 will put it back on my place. I am not right on the river. And with a flood crest of 252.8, it would put it back on my barns and buildings, cut my farm in two.

As some of the other people have stated here, it cuts your farm up, takes your bottom land, and makes your farm pretty much economical to operate.

Irrigation has been brought out here some, and we have been trying to irrigate some for probably 4 years. This project as water for irrigation does not look feasible. It is down too low to the tidewater, and not enough people below the reservoir to get the water from the reservoir to water a number of acres. The people in the upper regions of the reservoir, at the time you are going to need to irrigate crops, it would look like the reservoir would be drawn down, and in a lot of our cases, I think the water could be as much as a mile or two from our places.

I think what we need to do is to conserve more of our water. Agriculture is going to call for more water for irrigation in the future. And this thing doesn't look feasible as far as irrigation.

That is about all I have to say, unless there are some questions.

Mr. DAVIS. Any questions?

Mr. BECKER. How long have you been a farmer?

Mr. HAWKINS. Since 1938.

Mr. BECKER. Have any in your family before been farmers?

Mr. HAWKINS. Not in Culpeper County.

Mr. BECKER. But there have been farmers in your family.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. People that have farms have a love of the farm, do they not, a love of the land.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. It is not merely the material side, to want to make a living, but you have a farm and love to live on a farm and raise your family on a farm.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECKER. So the loss of the farm cannot be compensated for by the Government handing you so many dollars for it and telling you you can start over again by relocating elsewhere; is that true?

Mr. HAWKINS. That is right.

Mr. BECKER. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Nation's foremost exponent of the farmer, said that anybody who cannot make a living off a farm should get off, or words to that effect. Don't you think before we go into this philosophy thing, we ought to take up both sides of this issue?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman hasn't said he cannot make a living off the farm. He is perfectly satisfied.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I did not question that.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Are most of the farmlands affected here grazing land for cattle or actually for crops?

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, most of Culpeper County grazes and crops, both. I believe there are 115 to 125 farms that ship milk to Washington. There are a number of beef cattle produced in Culpeper County, and a number of hogs, and also grain.

Mr. ROGERS. About how many head graze to the acre, do you know?

Mr. HAWKINS. That depends right much. In some cases maybe 2 head to the acre and in other cases as many as 5 acres to 1 head.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Mrs. SCOTT. My name is Mrs. R. E. Scott, of Culpeper County, Elkwood, Va. May I say something in answer to Mr. Smith's saying that if you cannot make a living on a farm, you had better get off of it. That would leave an awful lot of our country barren and nothing happening on it, because not all farmers make money in this day and age. So if they left, you would have empty land, like you do in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado which is now a dust bowl.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Let me make that clear. I quoted the Secretary of Agriculture. I disagree violently with what he said.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I have to go to another meeting at 3:30. I would like to ask one question generally. Could we have a show of hands of the number of people in the audience opposed to this and for this, just to get an idea.

Mr. BAILEY. I was coming to that. All the people in this room who are opposed to the plan will please stand. Would you like to count them, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DAVIS. No, thank you. However, Judge Smith asked his people before noon not to come back because he wanted to be fair and let the opponents have the seats. So I do not think we would be treating the judge quite right if we asked for a standing vote on both sides of the question.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to present as the next witness Mr. G. R. Pruett, a farmer from Culpeper County.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE RAYMOND PRUETT, FARMER, CULPEPER COUNTY, VA.

Mr. PRUETT. My name is George Raymond Pruett. I am a farmer living in Culpeper County, Va. My farm consists of 450 acres situated on the banks of the beautiful Rapidan River. Of the 450 acres I own, 250 are in timber and the remaining 200 acres are in a high state of cultivation.

I raise Aberdeen-Angus cattle and carry a herd of approximately 75 head throughout the year. I also raise small grain and hay. As you probably know, Culpeper County was subjected to a severe drought during 1954. However I am one of the few farmers in the county who did not have to obtain drought relief hay or feed and my herd was well fed during the winter. At the present time I have corn in my cornhouse and hay in the barns; in addition I sold a considerable

amount of corn, small grain, and some hay. The reason I am so fortunate is not necessarily because of my farming abilities, but is due to my highly productive river-bottom land.

If this proposed dam is built my farm will be ruined. All that I will have left is a few acres of pasture. My cropland will be ruined and this valuable land will be lost forever as far as its value to agriculture is concerned.

Gentlemen, I speak of my farm as a typical example of farms in my immediate neighborhood. From Lignum to Raccoon Ford on the Rapidan there is an area of highly productive land now in a high state of cultivation. This area consists of approximately 14,000 acres of which 4,500 acres will be lost by creating a permanent flood. These 4,500 acres are the most valuable land in this area.

Because of the short length of time after receiving the notice about this hearing, it is impossible to furnish figures in regard to the amount of farm products produced in this area. However, I might state that there are 4 farms located at Batna that ship 1,000 gallons of milk to Washington daily.

As far as irrigation is concerned the farmers who have the equipment to irrigate at the present time, have access to water when a state of drought does not exist. However, if the dam is built, in time of drought when the pool level of the water is lowered in order to maintain the electrical output at the dam, water will not be available to farmers for irrigation. Furthermore, this water which has been flowing for ages for the use of man and beast would now be controlled by the Corps of Army Engineers and permission would have to be obtained in order to use the water which we have always used.

I quote the Army engineers in a talk before the Lignum Ruritan Club at Lignum, Va., on March 10, 1955:

> In time of drought such as was experienced during the summer of 1954, the pool level would be lowered 48 feet.

That would mean that the beautiful farmland which in summer is covered with waving grain or tall green corn, a sight for any man to behold, would become a mud flat infested with mosquitoes and unfit for anything.

It is a well-known fact that the population of the United States has been making an annual net gain of over 2 million persons for the past several years. Food is without doubt the greatest need of man. It is more important than electricity even in this electric age. We could do without electricity if necessary. Of course the nation would be crippled, but how long could man go without food?

Some years ago the United States Government realized the problem of feeding our people would always be present and that it would grow as our population grew. They also realized that we lost tons and tons of our valuable topsoil yearly by erosion. Therefore the Soil Conservation Service under the Department of Agriculture was established. This Service has operated an extensive program to educate farmers in better farming practices, such as strip or contour planting, the discouraging of corn crops, and the substitute planting of small grain and legumes. They have also assisted the farmers financially with the purchasing of lime and fertilizer for these crops. There are vast areas in the United States now in agriculture which should never have been plowed, consequently we have the great dust bowls. In all proba-

bility this land will be restored to prairie or woodland in the future. Furthermore, the Government now owns 20 percent of all the land in the United States which amounts to 1 acre out of every 5. Practically all this land has been taken out of production.

If this Salem Church Dam is built there will be added at least 45,000 acres to the Government's holdings and in this particular case it involves some of the best agriculture land in the State of Virginia.

Gentlemen, in closing I speak for myself and my neighbors. We are opposed to the building of this dam for the fact that the loss of this valuable irreplaceable farmland is far too great for the benefits that are supposed to be derived from this proposed hydroelectric dam.

Mr. DAVIS. Any questions?

We are ready for your next witness.

Mr. BAILEY. W. R. Graham of Culpeper County, Va., who will speak to us.

Mr. DAVIS. We know Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have worked in the committees in that position over there [indicating reporter] for 45 years.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. But this is the first time I have appeared before the committee in this capacity.

Mr. DAVIS. You know how to start off then, by giving your full name and address.

Mr. GRAHAM. I apologize to the reporter.

STATEMENT OF W. R. GRAHAM, ELKWOOD, CULPEPER COUNTY, VA.

My name is W. R. Graham. I have a farm in Culpeper County, Va., on the Rappahannock River. I am one of the official committee reporters of the House, and I come under the Speaker of the House. I cleared with the Speaker on my appearance here today.

I wanted to get the committee oriented as to the situation of Fredericksburg in relation to this land up here—if somebody will help me hold out this map. Back in 1946 the Army engineers would purchase all of the land that was subject to inundation in the time of the flood, and the total project would carry up to 258——

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Graham, there is a pointer right there. That is a little better.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the report of the Army engineers, House Document 119, the total area or the sea level elevation would carry up to 258 feet. This red part outlined here goes up to 260-foot contour.

I just want to use this map to show what is protected in Fredericksburg. Back in 1942 this little area through here [indicating] was what was flooded in Fredericksburg. This little area over here in Falmouth was the area that was flooded.

The witness this morning from Fredericksburg spoke about the bridge on No. 3 being out and another bridge. But the Williams Street Bridge was not flooded out, because I drove down there after the flood or during the flood and went across the Williams Street Bridge. So Fredericksburg was not completely cut off.

Now, then, I have another map here. This black portion represents the additional 20 feet. Each one of these squares represents approxi-

mately 250 acres of land. A rough calculation shows that there are between 25 and 30 of those squares or between 7,000 and 7,500 acres of land that are going to be taken out of production.

Another thing in connection with that, in a letter from the Chief of Engineers of May 17, 1946, they give a breakdown of the drawdown on the power pool at different periods of the year. They show a drawdown of 16 feet from high water to low water in a normal year, and in a drought period such as we had the last 2 years there would be an estimated drawdown of 48 feet. That means all this area in black in the normal year is going to be a mud flat every year. So there is no recreation in the project.

I would like to file a copy of the letter of the Chief of Engineers for the record.

Mr. DAVIS. It will be so ordered.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Washington 25, D. C., May 17, 1946.

Mr. W. R. GRAHAM,
Official Reporter to Committees,
House of Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 7, 1946, addressed to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concerning the effect of the proposed Salem Church Reservoir on your property near Kellys Ford, Va., has been referred to this office for reply.

The level of the proposed Salem Church Reservoir under normal operation for power production would not exceed elevation 240. The tentative schedule of operation calls for average levels at the end of each month as follows:

Month	Scheduled reservoir level	Month	Scheduled reservoir level
January	227	July	233
February	232	August	230
March	237	September	227
April	240	October	224
May	239	November	223
June	238	December	224

The elevations as listed above would extend back up the reservoir level for normal flows. During years of greater than normal flows the reservoir levels would be somewhat higher than indicated and during dry years, lower, and for a dry period such as was experienced in 1930 the maximum drawdown might be to elevation 192. This condition might never recur during the life of the project.

A reservation for storage of floodwaters would be made above the 240 level. The flood for which the project would be constructed for the protection of Fredericksburg would be 43 percent greater than the greatest flood of record which occurred in 1942. Such a flood might be expected to occur on an average of once in 200 years. If the power reservoir should be full when such a flood came, the reservoir might rise at the dam to elevation 252.8 and then recede in a period of several days. If the power pool were lower to start with, the level of the flood storage would be lower.

Under conditions with the flood pool at elevation 252.8 at the dam the water surface extending back up the reservoir would have a gradually rising elevation due to floodwater flowing into the basin. This so-called superelevation or backwater would gradually approach the water surface of the flood that would have normally existed if the reservoir had not been built. In this instance the backwater would disappear at the head of the rapids above Kellys Ford, about 2½ miles below Remington. Under this unusual flood condition calculations indicate that at the mouth of Mountain Run the floodwater surface would not exceed ele-

vation 257 with an elevation of 259 at Kellys Ford. In 1942 the flood level at the mouth of Mountain Run reached approximately elevation 235 and 242 at Kellys Ford. The low water levels at Mountain Run and at Kellys Ford are elevation 200 and 210, respectively.

It should be pointed out that prior to construction of the project, if authorized, surveys will be made to determine levels of possible inundation and flood easements and property purchases will be negotiated with all property owners affected.

If the above information is not adequate for your purpose you are invited to visit this office where your inquiry may receive the fullest personal attention possible with the information now available.

Very truly yours.

BYRON BIRD,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Executive Officer
(For the District Engineer.)

Mr. GRAHAM. I have already filed a statement with the clerk of the committee, which I ask to be included in the record.

The chairman asked this morning or this afternoon whether there have been some statistics given as to the loss in the area. I made a calculation of the number of acres lost based on 40,000 acres being taken out of production, and according to the 1950 agricultural census of products sold in these counties or the percentage of the agricultural products sold as represented by the area taken out of production it would be $760,000 a year. The expenditures of the area would be $989,000 a year; the farm labor, $139,000 a year.

That is the only thing I wanted to use the map for.

After the project was authorized in 1946, the Army engineers came in on June 4, 1947, before the Appropriations Committee and gave an estimate of the ratio of benefits to cost of 1.22 to 1. Then June 19, 1948, they came in with a request for $175,000 for planning money. That was denied.

Mr. DAVIS. Where are you reading from now?

Mr. GRAHAM. You mean in my statement?

Mr. DAVIS. In your statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not have the statement. It is the latter part of the statement there.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in the latter part of your statement? I was rather interested in page 13.

Mr. GRAHAM. It starts on page 12.

Mr. DAVIS. I was hitting pretty close. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. DAVIS. Back on the record now. Colonel Potter was asked this question by Mr. Rabaut:

What is the primary purpose of this dam?

Colonel POTTER. Flood control, 8 percent; power, 90 percent; navigation and other, 2 percent.

I was getting pretty close to you there. Where are you starting? On page 12?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I started on page 12. So they did not find that the dam was not economically feasible back there in 1947.

Then I will drop down to April 20, 1951, which was the portion that you read, Mr. Chairman, of the 8 percent. Well, the cost of the project had increased from seventeen million seven hundred thousand-some-odd dollars to $34 million, but they also increased the ratio of benefits to cost to 1.33 to 1 when the original estimate was 1.22 to 1. They were never able to get any money out of the Appropria-

tions Committee on the House side. They put in a request on the House side. It was denied. They went over to the Senate. The request was inserted in the Senate, got into conference, and it was taken out. They never got any money until around 1952 when they certified this project as essential to the national defense.

The total estimated production of electricity from the project from Salem Church Dam alone was somewhere around 54,000 kilowatts. In a dry period, it gets down to 8,000 and a little better kilowatts. Now, I can't imagine how that could possibly serve national defense.

You asked about the number of families that would be dispossessed. There have been various estimates made. In one place it was 55 groups of buildings, in another place 42 families, in another place 29 farms. On the map that was outlined in red I had a calculation made that showed a total of 140 to 147 farm units, not families, but farm units. Some of those farm units represent anywhere from 5 to 12 families. So what the total number of people might amount to that would be dispossessed is only a matter of guesswork. There has been no actual estimate made of it.

But, whatever number it is, those people will be displaced Americans. They surely should be entitled to as much consideration as displaced aliens or foreigners.

No mention has been made about the number of miles of roads and the number of bridges, but the engineers' estimate shows 14 miles of road and 8 bridges.

Now, back in 1942 when they had the flood, there was a cloudburst in Fredericksburg preceding the flood. The cloudburst caused a lot of the damage. There was no separation made between the damage caused by the cloudburst and the damage caused by the flood. It was all charged up to the flood.

This project was authorized as a flood-control project. It has been 13 years since there has been a flood down there. At the present time Fredericksburg wants a water supply. The Government has not been in the business of providing municipal water supplies in the past. Fredericksburg has not made any effort as far as I can ascertain to provide a water supply for itself. I understand it does not have any reservoirs down there of its own for a water supply.

Then, there was some mention made of hauling water from Fredericksburg to Culpeper. I do not know why it would be necessary to haul water from Fredericksburg to Culpeper because Culpeper was utilizing a pond in an old quarry to supplement its water supply from Mountain Run. Also along No. 3 there are two or three other ponds where people could get water and were hauling water all the time.

Now, the floods that we have down there in that section are entirely different from the floods that they have out in the West. These floods last for a matter of 24 to 36 hours and the flood is gone. There is no loss of life. Property damage, true. The only loss of life that ever occurred down there was outside of the area that they propose to flood or to inundate. And those three people lost their lives by their own foolhardiness. Some of them attempted to cross against the advice of others, and in one case down below Remington they did not know that the road was washed out on the approach to the bridge, and the boy and the girl started through in an automobile and were washed over. But that was not the cause of the flood.

Then, in connection with power, atomic energy is coming into use today. Great Britain has appropriated or authorized eight hundred-some-odd million dollars for the development of a million and a half to 2 million kilowatts of power. Estimating the power to be generated from this dam on the basis of the cost for Great Britain, this dam's power could be developed for around $30 million. And that would be 24-hour, 100 percent energy, not peaking load.

I was interested in the suggestion made by Mr. Thompson this morning for a resurvey, and what we ask for is that no increase be made in the authorization until after a resurvey has been made and a report submitted by the engineers. If you increase the authorized height at the present time, then they can proceed with the project without making any survey based on the different economic situation in that territory.

Then, I want to say that this is really the first opportunity that the opponents have had to make a fight against this dam. We feel that back there in 1946 the cards were stacked against us. Anything that was labeled as flood control was going through, and it was not really flood control, and there is no real flood control in the project. As you read from the statement there, there is only 8 percent credited to flood control.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I thank the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. Questions from my right?

From my left?

Mr. BECKER. On page 12 and page 13 of your statement, the questions and answers between Mr. Rabaut and Colonel Potter, I have not had a chance to read it here, but was that in 1951?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that was April 20, 1951.

Mr. BECKER. In other words, at that time the estimates given were flood control 8 percent——

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. Power, 90 percent; navigation and other, 2? That was the last testimony on this?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the last testimony.

Mr. BECKER. Those are the figures?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. Do you assume that from the information you have given today these have been changed proportionately?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. It is still power and water supply for Fredericksburg and that section down there.

There is one other thing I would like to say. The gentleman from Stafford said they had no objection down there, that the farm bureau had no objection down there. Stafford will only have somewhere around 8,000 acres affected. Culpeper has 11,900. Spotsylvania has 11,900 acres. And Stafford is one of the smallest ones. Orange is really the smallest one.

Mr. DAVIS. How long have you owned your farm down there, Mr. Graham?

Mr. GRAHAM. I bought it in 1942. It is not much of a farm. Financially I would be much better off if they took it away from me.

Mr. DAVIS. How far away do you live from the farm?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, my home is at Falls Church, but I bought the farm as a dream of 60 years. I always loved farmlife. I was always looking around for a farm.

Mr. DAVIS. Any other questions?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I note this is called the Salem Church project. I belong to a church that takes a little more water than most churches. I wonder if this is a Baptist Church?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could'nt tell you. I'm supposed to be a Baptist, but I don't know.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very, very much for a very excellent presentation.

Mr. GRAHAM. It wasn't as long as my statement.

Mr. DAVIS. The statement will be made part of the record.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Graham is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF W. R. GRAHAM

I exhibit a map showing the taking area using the 260-foot contour and assuming the taking area would follow the contour throughout. It represents somewhere in the neighborhood of 40,000 acres. If one can assume that practical considerations would govern the line of taking, then straight lines would be run across the tips of small indentations. This would involve many additional acres. Further, where portions of farm units are destroyed, or the providing of new roads to farms would not be considered economically justified, such farms would be taken over in their entirety, thus again increasing the taking area. So, in the final outcome, the likelihood is that 50,000 acres or more may be removed from the tax rolls. General Crawford, at page 113 of the hearings, 1946, stated there would be 32,000 acres inundated by the flood pool, and there is provision in the plan for an additional 18 feet to cover the designed flood, errors in estimating the backwater curve, etc.

The land not included in the power pool proper would be rented or leased for continued cultivation. While this may in considerable measure prevent permanent destruction of productivity of such acres, a landowning economy will be changed to an economy of tenant farmers. And such an economy in this country has never been considered desirable.

Present estimates are that 140 families will be displaced, but back in 1946 (hearings p. 58) the engineers claimed there were only 55 groups of buildings located in the reservoir. At a meeting of the Culpeper Rotary Club at Richardsville, attended by representatives of the Army engineers, it was stated at least 29 farms would be inundated and 42 families displaced, and there would be minor relocation of highways. There estimates are based on a map of 1943 vintage; so it is hard to understand the wide discrepancy. An examination of the map shows really 147 farm units, not families, will be affected and some of these units represent 4 and 5 families. So what the total number of families may be is problematical; but it is greatly in excess of 140. However,. whatever the correct number may be, these families will become displaced Americans and certainly are deserving of as much consideration as are displaced persons from foreign lands.

Information obtained from Judge Smith's office is the only 2,000 acres of farm and pastureland are involved in the proposed additional 20 feet of pool level. The portions outlined in black on this second map depict the area involved in the additional 20 feet and a rough calculation shows at least 7,000 acres of cultivated and pastureland will be involved—not 2,000.

Further, the contemplated annual drop in pool level is 16 feet; so the black portions represent the area that will become mud flats and slime. In a dry period the drop will be 48 feet. These drops in pool level are taken from a letter of the Chief of Engineers submitted herewith. What kind of recreational area will the power pool provide under these circumstances? What a beautiful vista for summer cottages. And this is a condition that will prevail throughout the entire shoreline of the power pool.

Various figures have been tossed around in the hearings (1946), the engineers' (H. Doc. 119), and in statements in the press, as to the character of the land to be included in the project area. For instance, in House Document 119 the statement appears:

"In the flood of 1942, upstream from Fredericksburg, the flood area totaled 13,000 acres, of which 8,500 were cultivated. On the Rapidan and Robertson Rivers, including Lutheran Valley, 12,700 acres were under water, of which 8,900 were cultivated. * * *"

However, an insertion supplied for the hearings (1946) by General Crawford reads:

"The total area inundated by the reservoir at the top of the power pool is 21,300 acres of which 17,600 acres are wooded lands, and 3,700 acres are cultivated, pasture, and open land. Included in this area there are approximately 1,050 acres of cultivated land along the Rapidan River from Racoon Ford downstream for approximately 7 miles. * * *"

But their own map shows several thousand acres in this Racoon Ford area will be inundated and Mr. Pruett, whose farm lies in that section and who is familiar with the operations and holdings of the most of his neighbors, has stated there are at least 3,000 acres which will be inundated in the Batna area alone.

Let us look next at the highway and bridge destruction involved. In the hearing on the civil functions appropriation bill, April 20, 1951, the engineers supplied the following information:

"* * * it appears that construction of the Salem Church Reservoir will require the relocation or the construction of approximately 14 miles of highway, including the utilities adjacent thereto, and 8 bridges. Final determination has not been made pending further consultations with the State and local authorities and additional design studies."

But this was not what they stated at the Richardsville Rotary meeting in the fall of 1952, that "there would be minor relocation of highways."

Thirteen years have passed since the project was authorized in 1946. Fredericksburg at that time was mainly interested—at least for publication—in flood control. Floods affecting that town had been few and far between and, since 1942, there has been no recurring flood. So let us look at the arguments now being made for the project.

A meeting of the Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce was held the evening of March 23 and a circular passed out at that meeting as to the purposes of the project as then envisioned contained the following statements:

"*Drought control.*—The dam was primarily designed for flood control, but the major importance is for the control of the flow of the river in order to conserve it for the protection of man and beast during the period of drought. This has become so important within the past few years. No living being, man or animal, can survive without water, and unless we adopt every means possible for supplying that water when needed, our situation can rapidly become most critical. If drought conditions continue, Fredericksburg and communities on the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers west of Fredericksburg will have reached a dead end as far as furture growth is concerned. Last summer Fredericksburg had to curtail the use of water and at one time was within a matter of days of calling such a drastic curb that industrial plants employing thousands of people would have been seriously affected. During that period several business firms in the town of Culpeper were hauling water from Fredericksburg, as were several communities in nearby counties. It would be impossible for Fredericksburg or any other community in the Rappahannock or Rapidan River Valleys to accommodate any new industry, business or agency that would require any sizable quantity of water in view of the present water supply outlook. There is no indication that this outlook will change; in fact, the situation probably will grow worse. The Salem Dam Reservoir would be a lifesaver to this entire area."

At long last the cards are on the table face up. But much of this is counting chickens before they are hatched. In the first place, their dire forebodings are yet to happen. They may never happen. But what is a certainty, is that the area shown on the map will be destroyed if the project is ever constructed.

What did they say about flood control?

"*Flood control.*—It is important to control the flow of the river for protection of flood states, which may not only result in the tremendous loss or damage to property, but to the life of both man and animal."

As to preventing loss of life to man and animals, there is no record of any loss of life at any time caused by the flooding of these rivers. The only loss of life was due not to the flood, but the foolhardiness of the individuals. And even this loss of life was outside of the proposed project area. So loss of life is out.

The next benefit which they say will be derived is recreation.

"*Recreation.*—It would be a means of providing recreation on both sides of the river above the dam for miles, which would not only affect Stafford and the surrounding areas, but the benefits would extend for miles beyond the area itself."

I have already exhibited a map showing the areas along the banks of the power pool which will be mudflats and slime during the vacation months. So recreation is out—and so admitted by the engineers at a meeting of the Ruritan Club held at Lignum on March 10.

As to benefiting wildlife, there is plenty in the area now and the flooding of the bottom lands will tend to decrease rather than increase it.

As to electric power, they say:

"*Electric power.*—While it may be important to generate electricity from the excess flow of the river it is far less important than the preceding benefits. It seems uneconomical and wasteful to permit the energy stored up in so useful a manner to be permitted to flow by day and night, without conserving as much as we can without too much loss to the other benefits enumerated."

Let us look at the validity of this claim. Over 90 percent of the project admittedly is power. Collier's Encyclopedia gives the cost of producing steam power as a high of 1.44 cents per kilowatt-hour to a low of 0.353 and an average of 0.56 cent. The report of the engineers (p. 50, H. Doc. 119) gives the cost at Salem Church at 0.51 cent. This is but 0.5 mill lower than the average cost of steam power. Also, the 5.6 mills mentioned above is based on prices which obtained back in 1946, since which time the cost of Salem Church Dam has more than doubled and the 5 mills may now be near the high cost of 1.44 cents for steam.

TVA has 10 steam plants with an installed capacity of 1,350,000 kilowatts, or an average of 135,000 kilowatts. The combined production of Salem Church and Fredericksburg in the proposed project is 76,300 kilowatts (H. Doc. 119, p. 48) or about one-half the average capacity of the 10 steam plants of TVA. Also, of the 76,300 kilowatts, Salem Church would produce only 54,500 (p. 48), or about one-third the average capacity of TVA's steam plants.

Furthermore, the practicability of developing power by atomic energy has now been demonstrated. The submarine *Nautilus* has proved that and Secretary Thomas has stated "The tests of the *Nautilus* far exceeded their expectations and have brought the use of atomic power for battleships much closer than their wildest dreams could hope for." So in the not too far distant future the use of atomic energy may make obsolete both steam and hydro development of power. Even at the present time private development of electricity by atomic energy is underway in this country in New Jersey and Pittsburgh; also Great Britain is embarking on the development of 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 kilowatts by atomic power a cost of approximately $850 million. On the basis of Great Britain's generating 1,500,000 kilowatts at a cost of $850 million, this would represent an outlay for 54,500 kilowatts of approximately $30 million. And this would be firm power 24 hours of the day.

Also, based on the use of available storage during the critically dry period of 1930–32, the engineers' report states: "* * * the continuous power would be 8,100 kilowatts at Salem Church project * * * (Doc. 119, p. 8)

And in the dry period, when the flow of the rivers is at the minimum, the water in the reservoir will be needed to generate power and cannot be made to serve two masters—both power and irrigation. It cannot be used anyway except by obtaining consent of the power authority and even then would not be available to the fertile valleys in the upper reaches of the rivers, because no water will be left in the pool in these areas; it will have been used to provide power. So irrigation is out.

On September 13, 1954, at a meeting in Fredericksburg sponsored by the Chancellor Ruritan Club, Mr. Houston, city manager, said while the city needs it badly to assure an adequate water supply in the future, he also feels the project would greatly improve the surrounding counties; that construction of the dam would probably determine how much water Fredericksburg could sell to residents of Stafford and Spotsylvania.

So now it is municipal water supply. And what has Fredericksburg done to help itself?

Without making any effort of its own to provide flood protection, Fredericksburg is asking for the destruction of the livelihood of hundreds of others who now depend on farming and dairying operations along the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers and the many little creeks and runs in their respective watersheds.

At page 43, House Document 119, 80th Congress, the engineers' report states:

"Alternative methods for the protection of Fredericksburg consist of levees or channel improvement although these schemes do not meet the desires of the

local interests. The town of Falmouth, across the river from Fredericksburg, suffers damage from the same flood stages as does its larger neighbor. Relief would be afforded by the same methods as outlined for Fredericksburg."

There is no claim in the above that levee protection is not practical or economical, but at page 11 of the same document this statement is found:

"Local interests at Fredericksburg * * * state that a dike or levee along the waterfront would destroy the value of much property."

Land surrounding Fredericksburg which would have to be taken to provide levee protection is at present mostly waste and of little value, but at page 39 of House Document 119, paragraph 86, the following appears:

"In a brief presented on behalf of the city of Fredericksburg, it was stated that a dike or levee along the waterfront would destroy the value of all property between the Rappahannock River and Sophia Street."

I present a group of pictures of the vicinity of Sophia Street, together with pictures of the river, taken from the Williams Street and Jeff Davis Highway Bridges. The flood did not top the Williams Street Bridge which is about level with the grade of Sophia Street at that point.

This whole project has been built around protecting Fredericksburg. They are the ones pressing for its execution. The Fredericksburg area affected by the flood of 1942 was variously estimated from a high by the engineers of 160 acres (H. Doc. 119, p. 36) to a low of 110 acres by Colonel Scheidenhelm, a consulting engineer employed by the Virginia Electric & Power Co. (hearings, 1946, p. 96). However, the total direct and indirect damages resulting from that flood were estimated as $1,225,300 (H. Doc. 119, p. 37). Also, the 160 acres must certainly have included land shown in the photos along the riverbank at Fredericksburg and Falmouth.

Now, let us see what caused the damage to Fredericksburg in the flood of 1942. At page 33 of House Document 119, the following appears, paragraph 65:

"A valley cuts through the middle of Fredericksburg along Kenmore Avenue for the entire length of the city. The elevation of the floor of this valley is at approximately 40 feet above mean sea level for most of its length and therefore above the level of any but extreme floods. In 1942, the depth of inundation in this valley was 3 feet, or 2 feet over the first floors of some residences. Flooding was attributed to two sources. The first was the result of the cloudburst on October 15 when runoff from Maryes Heights draining into Kenmore Avenue Valley was augmented by runoff from high street levels southwest of Princess Anne Street which drained through the culvert under Washington Avenue between Pitt Street and the power canal. The second source of flooding was from the flood crest of the Rappahannock River which arrived by the time the first inundation had receded. * * *"

Even the construction of the proposed dam would not prevent in the future a recurrence of the flooding of Fredericksburg from the first mentioned source. Furthermore, the engineers' report does not separate the loss caused by the cloudburst from the loss caused by the flooding of the river. It is all charged to the latter. This raises the query whether all of the damage might not have occurred from the cloudburst and not the flood.

The floods of 1937 and 1942 were the highest of record in this area, the highest being in 1942. Previous to 1937, the highest of record was in 1889. Back over a period of 60 years floods have occurred in 1889, 1893, 1901, 1937 and 1942—or an average of one every 12 years. Yet to eliminate a damage of $1,225,300, even charging all of the damage to the flooding of the river and forgetting the cloudburst, it is proposed to destroy a yearly economic return from agriculture of many times that amount, as well as to destroy the economy of an area extending 29 miles above the dam in the one case and 33 miles in the case of the Rapidan River.

Floods in these rivers differ materially from those which are generally pictured in one's mind. The public usually thinks of floods as those which occur on the Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas and Ohio Rivers, lasting for days and weeks and resulting in tremendous economic loss, as well as loss of life. Floods on the Rappahannock and Rapidan are a matter at most of 1- or 2-days' duration. The engineers had to go out of the proposed pool area to show any loss of life in the 1942 flood, and even this loss of life, as before stated, was due to the foolhardiness of the persons killed and not the flood.

But to show the economic loss to the five counties involved, the following table, based on the 1950 Census of Agriculture, shows the approximate loss to each, assuming 40,000 acres being taken out of production—both timber and cropland.

Economic statistics of area

County	Farm acres	Acres owned	Value of products sold	Annual expenditures	Hired labor
Culpepper:					
Totals	174,300	144,255	$3,936,929	$2,793,000	$376,999
Expropriated, 7 percent	11,904		275,583	195,510	26,320
Farquier:					
Totals	315,000	233,613	7,035,095	5,496,000	813,000
Expropriated, .025 percent	7,680		175,925	137,400	20,325
Orange:					
Totals	158,200	119,383	2,397,319	1,842,000	563,000
Expropriated, 3 percent	4,608		71,919	55,260	16,890
Spotsylvania:					
Totals	134,000	126,000	1,665,466	1,172,000	517,000
Expropriated, 9 percent	11,904		149,886	105,480	46,530
Stafford:					
Totals	76,000	70,000	723,947	801,000	242,000
Expropriated, 12 percent	8,832		86,868	96,120	29,040
Totals expropriated	44,928		760,181	989,770	139,105

Grand totals, $1,489,056.

And what would this represent to Culpeper County? Its recent revenue estimates show $195,000 to be received from real estate taxes out of total receipts from all sources of $425,000. Seven percent of $195,000 would represent a considerable loss in a total budget of the size indicated.

The economy of the whole project area has greatly changed since the engineers' survey was made, which was prior to 1946. Maps presently available are produced from data developed prior to 1943. Also, present engineer estimates of cost are nearly three times their original estimate of 1946, having gone from $17.7 million at that time to $41 plus million as of 2 years ago and now $50 million. This latter estimate is based on increased costs of construction as shown by the rise in the price index, and this index takes no account of the great change which may take place in the economy of a particular area. Certainly before any change is made in the present authorized height, a new survey at least should be had and a more realistic estimate made based on present conditions and values.

Further, in reporting on the project benefits, the following appears at page 94 of the hearings, 1946:

"Colonel SCHEIDENHELM. * * * I refer to the fact that the engineers' report takes credit, to the extent of 31.4 percent, for benefits in the form of removing from flood damage that land which will be flooded by the Salem Church Reservoir. That is positively wrong."

In other words, the engineers include in their estimate of benefits to be derived from the dam that land which now is occasionally inundated, but which occasional inundation it is proposed to make permanent. And the statement of Colonel Scheidenhelm was never denied.

The author of the present bill did not represent Fredericksburg in 1946. He then opposed the dam and the same objections which were voiced by him at that time are still valid. Also, the present limitation of 220 feet was inserted to meet in part the objections of his then constituents (Congressional Record, 1946, vol. 92, pt. 6, p. 7087. Letter of Mr. Whittington to Governor Tuck, dated May 24, 1946). And at that time (hearings, 1946, p. 68), Judge Smith stated, "We are going to fight to the last ditch to keep from being flooded." Judge Smith's district now includes Fredericksburg, but it also still includes the area which will be affected by the proposed project and should be equally as deserving of his representation as Fredericksburg.

MAY 24, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK,
Governor, Richmond, Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR TUCK: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 17 in behalf of a modification of the Rappahannock River Dam to say that I recall the testimony and the desire of the citizens above the dam that the elevation be reduced to 200 feet. The committee went into this reduction carefully and it was found that the low dam could not be justified. However, upon receipt of your second letter in behalf of a 220-foot elevation, I transmitted the same to the Chief of Engineers and I now hand herewith to you a copy of a letter from

him to me, dated May 23, 1946, from which you will observe that he can conform to your recommendation as well *as a similar recommendation made by Representative Howard Smith.* The authorization of the project will be flexible enough to enable the Chief of Engineers to limit the height as suggested.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Representative Howard Smith. It is always a pleasure to give careful consideration to any matter that either you or he brings to my attention.

Very sincerely yours,

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control.

Copy to Hon. Howard Smith, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(The above letter appears at p. 7087, vol. 92, pt. 6, Congressional Record, 1946. [Italics supplied.])

Since authorization of the project in 1946, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public, 566, 83d Cong.) has become law; also a Virginia advisory legislative council committee was directed by the 1954 general assembly to study the all-important problems of water used and conservation of water resources in the State of Virginia and report back to the general assembly in 1956. This committee is now active and may come forward with a plan which will greatly relieve, if not wholly eliminate, any future flood threat to Fredericksburg and Falmouth. Many farmers and landowners have already constructed or are beginning the construction of ponds and reservoirs for the conservation of water falling on their land and the number so doing is increasing almost daily. This will further decrease the runoff into the rivers and could result in materially lessening the water available in the power pool, and to an extent which would make any supply of electric energy from that source wholly undependable.

Lastly, when the engineers came forward year after year, following the authorization of the project in 1946, with requests for funds, although the authorized pool level was 20 feet below that recommended, they always showed a favorable cost-benefit ratio until, after spending about $67,000 of a $100,000 allotment of funds authorized by the President on a certification that the project was essential to the national defense, they were forced to admit the project would not pay out. And with the changed conditions which now exist it is probable that no project of this nature could pay out.

The following is a transcript of what appears in the respective hearings of the Appropriations Committee on the civil functions bill:

[Vol. 1379, p. 495, June 4, 1947]

"Colonel FERINGA. The first project on the list with power is the Salem Church Reservoir in the Rappahannock River Basin. That appears on page 277.

"That was authorized by the act of 1946, at a total estimated Federal cost of $25 million at the 1946 price level. That has a total storage in acre-feet of 1,117,000 acre-feet.

"The power features are as follows: Power storage, 644,000 acre-feet; initial installation in kilowatts, 54,500. The cost of the power features amounts to $5,750,000 and the total benefits, including benefits for power, is estimated at $1,475,500. The ratio of benefits to cost is 1.22.

"(Discussion off the record.)"

[Vol. 1400, p. 471, Jan. 19, 1948]

"Salem Church Reservoir		$30, 290, 000
"1950	$175, 000	
1951	175, 000	
1952	200, 000	
1953	1, 400, 000"	

[Vol. 1520, p. 370, Jan. 17, 1950]

"$33, 000, 000 $100, 000 for 1951"

[Vol. 1592, pp. 598–600, April 20, 1951]

"$34, 650, 000 1.33 percent

"Flood control	8
Power	90
Navigation	1
Other	1

"The Salem Church project will supply peaking hydroelectric power to a power-supply area which includes the major part of the State of Virginia together with small portions of northeastern North Carolina and eastern West Virginia and is served principally by one large electric utility system, the Virginia Electric & Power Co. The major cities served are Richmond, Norfolk, Portsmouth, New port News, Petersburg, and Alexandria, all of which are in Virginia. In 1948, the Federal Power Commission estimated that the peak demand of the market area for the year 1955 would be 920,000 and that the existing power facilities in the area, including definitely scheduled additions and excluding steam-electric capacity which will probably be retired, will be capable of furnishing about 800,000 kilowatts. Construction of the Salem Church Reservoir project will provide considerable additional power capacity to this area."

[Vol. 1520, pp. 600–601, Jan. 17, 1950]

"Mr. RABAUT. Referring now the Salem Church Reservoir: What is the pool level on which the benefit ratio is based?

"Colonel POTTER. The law does not permit us to operate it above elevation 220.

"Mr. RABAUT. I want to know what the pool level is.

"Colonel POTTER. Two hundred and twenty feet.

"Mr. RABAUT. What is the benefit-cost ratio, and what is the pool level on which the benefit-cost ratio is based?

"Colonel POTTER. The power pool elevation is 220 and the benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.33.

"Mr. RABAUT. What was the pool elevation contemplated in the authorizing legislation?

"Colonel POTTER. Two hundred and twenty feet maximum elevation for the power pool, sir.

"Mr. RABAUT. What is the primary purpose of this dam?

"Colonel POTTER. Flood control, 8 percent; power, 90 percent; navigation and other, 2 percent.

"Mr. RABAUT. What relocations were contemplated in the authorizing legislation?

"Colonel POTTER. I will have to furnish that for the record.

"(The information requested is as follows:)

"Although only limited planning work has been accomplished on the project, it appears that construction of the Salem Church Reservoir will require the relocation or the construction of approximately 14 miles of highway, including the utilities adjacent thereto, and 8 bridges. Final determination has not been made pending further consultation with State and local authorities and additional design studies.

"Mr. RABAUT. Is there a general demand for power?

"Colonel POTTER. Yes.

"Mr. RABAUT. By whom?

"Colonel POTTER. The major cities to be served: Norfolk, Richmond, Newport News, Pettersburg, and Alexandria, all in Virginia.

"In 1948 the Federal Power Commission estimated the power demands for the marketing year of 1955 would be 920,000 kilowatts and that the existing power facilities in the area, including defense scheduled items, and excluding steam, with a probable present capacity to furnish about 800,000 requiring an additional 120,000 kilowatts."

This present hearing is the first real opportunity afforded those most vitally affected to prepare and present the true picture. The report which the engineers had taken several years to develop (and when finally published covered 69 pages of printed matter), was held in the office of the chairman of the Committee on Flood Control in typewritten form and was not available in pamphlet form until February 1947, almost a year after the hearings were held. This was contrary to the practice which had theretofore obtained for many years. The report was also practically unavailable to members of the committee at that time who, no doubt, relied wholly on the testimony developed at the hearings in arriving at their decision of the soundness of the project. And neither the testimony of the Engineer nor proponents developed the facts.

It is a well-recognized principle of law that the burden of proof is on the proponent. In the case of projects such as the one proposed, this principle seems to be reversed and this under circumstances where all of the advantages are with the proponent. The agency making the investigation is Government supported; its time is unlimited; its representatives have every facility at their

disposal. On the other hand, the opponents must provide for their defense out of their own resources; only such time as they can spare from other occupations can be devoted to its preparation; they do not have the same access to facts and figures as are availabe to the Government agency. In a court of law, counsel is furnished to the underprivileged by the court and no greater need exists for adequate assistance to protect a community's interests than in projects such as these. It is no rejoinder that these interests are consulted in the preparation of plans by the engineers, because such is not in reality the case. One cannot go into a conference where a map is exhibited and a statement made of the engineers' findings and intelligently discuss the pros and cons unless previous ample opportunity has been provided to study all the facts. And this was not true in the preparation of the plans for this project prior to 1946, or even at the time of the congressional hearing. Such preparation as has now been possible is only because of the time intervening between the introduction of Judge Smith's bill and the present hearing, and even now only a partial presentation of the economic facts is possible.

Up to the present time, Congress has not adopted the policy of providing municipal and industrial water supplies and, if this project is not in reality for flood control, then there is no present law under which it can be authorized. The facts presented by the proponents and substantiated by the opponents amply prove that the project cannot legitimately be classified as being for flood control. The opponents beseech you not only to deny the proponents' plea, but to deauthorize the project in order that continued opposition to any appropriation for its construction may not in the future be necessary.

At the very least, the matter should be held in abeyance until a further full investigation and report is made by the engineers, in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture.

I thank you.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a pretty good point on which to conclude, don't you think, Senator?

Mr. BAILEY. I think we have a couple more here we would like to present if you bear with us. I realize our time is slipping by, but we have two more men we would like to present.

Mr. DAVIS. Judge Smith told us this morning to give you more time than he took, so that is a fact.

Mr. BAILEY. He is always a very liberal-hearted gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS. You have had more, so you are way beyond him now.

Mr. BAILEY. At this time I would like to call on Mr. H. F. Scholtz, of Fauquier County.

STATEMENT OF H. F. SCHOLTZ, FAUQUIER COUNTY, VA.

Mr. SCHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Herman F. Scholtz. I am a farmer, retired engineer. I live 5 miles outside of Warrenton with a farm on the Rappahannock.

The preceding witnesses have covered a great deal of the facts which I desired to present to the committee, so I will not repeat them except in very brief detail.

As an engineer, I have spent a great deal of time on rural electrification investigations and river flow and so forth. The last 10 years though I have been trying to make a living off farming in Warrenton. But going over these facts that have been presented to you briefly and the figures I have that were made available through the publications, the total cost of this dam—I think it is the 220-foot level—is $46 million. Am I correct? $46 million. Of which 90 percent is power, 8 percent flood control, 2 percent other benefits.

Now, I think the fact of power has been ably presented by preceding speakers, who advise us that they have power available for the needs of the area and also the possibilities of increasing to 1 million kilo-

watts. So I am not going into the power situation. The facts which you have already had presented are in accordance with my notes here.

The point I am most interested in is flood control, and flood control means soil and forest preservation. I am not affected by flooding. My land, although fronting a mile and a half on the Rappahannock, is not embraced in this proposed flooding scheme down at Salem Church. It is not touched. But I have taken a great interest in this river, and in 8 years I have found that the bed of the river has built up approximately 1 foot—that is, at sea level; 1 foot. That is caused by deposits of soil brought down in these heavy floods or rains. I won't call them floods. Heavy rains. The river becomes flooded and there are obstructions in the stream.

And along my place I think I have cut out at least a dozen trees and things that have fallen across the river and which have impeded the flow, building up small dams all along, causing the sediment and the building up of the riverbed.

Now, I have not been below the Fauquier Springs, but I think you will find that same condition existing in the bed of the Rappahannock River as far down as the site of the dam.

The expense was not too great, and I had all these trees removed to give the river free flow. I think if the river was cleared of all the obstructions to allow the channel to scour sufficiently, the water would flow off much better, and the bed of the stream will not build up.

Now, this is a very serious proposition with the dam. Unless we have soil conservation preventing the washing of the soil up at the head of the rivers and also the washing of soil induced in the cutting of timber, we are going to have a buildup. This soil is going to, with a clear channel, gradually settle in the body of the dam itself. Then that is a problem.

With the 8 percent of this figure, which totals approximately $3,700,000, I think it would be a much wiser investment for the State and the country and the people if this money was used to help those farmers along the streams to build ponds and dams to catch this excess water during the flood season of a cloudburst, or what you may have, and store it on their farms.

I have one lake, or pond you might call it, 3½ acres, which I have had for 4 years now. I have just finished 3 more, 1 of 7½ acres with a maximum depth of 18 feet and an average depth over the whole 7½ acres of 8 feet. That is a tremendous amount of water. This will help the farmers over times of drought. It will provide water for their livestock and irrigation if they want it for that.

But, as the previous speaker has said, there has been very little irrigation in our section.

Now, good work is now being done by the Government in the Agricultural Conservation Service, and they do good work. They help as many people as they have funds for. And I think that service in promoting soil conservation and storage ponds for excess water deserves far more consideration than building a dam which will cost around $41 million if the power part of it is eliminated. Of course, the dam could be lower. But I think a very small fraction of the 8 percent which is allotted to flood control will help to relieve the flood situation.

Now, that is what Fredericksburg is complaining about—floods and water supply. With the building of these ponds, controlling the

waters of the headwaters and along the stream down toward the dam site, we will eliminate the flood. They won't have as much. We will take the water away—the flood water, the excess water. That will be removed. And the normal flow of the river will continue and without these periodic rises.

So the flood control is answered in that way in my opinion.

Now, then, we come to building the dam and the lake and the land surrounding it. I have in my river-land farm about 650 acres, of which 110 acres are bottom land, rich bottom land, about 400 acres are woods, and the rest rolling, rocky hill land which can be used, if we get grass growing on it again, for cattle grazing.

But by condemning all of the bottom land, the adjoining land on farms is ruined. The land that is condemned may be small in acreage, but it ruins additional acreage in many farms which largely exceeds the bottom land.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the witness a question there? In severance damages to the farm, that is a factor that is taken into consideration in determining the damage sustained by the farm itself. Isn't that true? That has always been the practice; has it not?

Mr. SCHOLTZ. Well, I tell you. Somebody said the Secretary of Agriculture said if you can't make a living on the farm you should get off the farm, but you would be surprised if you knew the number of people who don't actually make money on the farm. I don't. I haven't yet. I hope to. But they don't make money, and they spend an awful lot and create a lot of employment to support the families around there. In Farquier County alone, it will run well over a million dollars, the money spent there for which they get no return. I am positive that that figure is very low.

Now, on creating recreation areas, in the State of Virginia I think we have among the finest parks in the country and spots there for recreation. We are getting to make the entire State nothing but a recreation State. We have got to work. I mean we don't need a place for boating and swimming. In Farquier County the people themselves have built a lake of about 70 acres. They have boating and fishing, and the fish are being planted this year. And they have swimming. Anybody is free to come and fish in my ponds. I don't care who they are. They can swim in the summer, and they can fish at any time. And many of these ponds that have been built out of the people's own pockets are available for recreation. So I should think the recreation idea should be forgotten.

Now, we have another question. That is water supply. I followed the proceeding rather closely this morning, and I find that the water requirements of Fredericksburg are quite large. That is, Fredericksburg and Sylvania Corp. Fredericksburg is 5 million gallons a day, and Sylvania is 25 million gallons a day.

Well, now, other cities in this country have water supply problems and they solve them by reservoirs. Why should all the people in the county and the State and the country be taxed to supply water supply for one community? It is not fair.

Furthermore, if the dam is built, the lake created, the recreation area created, the people adjoining this lake will not be able to use the water if they want to use it for water supply, and it is possible that restrictions will be placed further upstream too if that water is used for the city itself.

I thank the committee for listening to me. I only knew that this meeting was to be held on Thursday night. I hadn't a chance to type my remarks. But I thank you and I wish to register my opposition to this proposed bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Just 1 minute. Mr. Becker wants to ask you a question, please.

Mr. BECKER. I was very much interested in all of your testimony, sir, but particularly the very last part where you dealt with the question of securing water for a locality and placing the cost on other areas of the county, State and Nation. Up in my area in Long Island we are dependent upon water from our own resources. We have to drive artesian wells. We do it either through private companies or we do it through establishing water districts through our town boards.

Now, is it know anywhere that in Fredericksburg they have attempted to secure water for themselves as was testified by another gentleman in Culpeper where they drove a well? Has Fredericksburg attempted in any way to provide water for themselves by artesian wells or otherwise?

Mr. SCHOLTZ. I am afraid I cannot answer that, but we have solved that problem at Warrenton. We have, by driving wells, increased our water supply so that the town itself has a sufficient amount.

Mr. BECKER. So actually a supply of water for Fredericksburg could be solved if they haven't already, by the possibility of driving artesian wells the same as we do. We have no watershed on Long Island as New York City has from the Delaware River and the Hudson.

Mr. SCHOLTZ. There is also the possibility of supplying water for Fredericksburg by taking certain locations which are fed by streams, which water can be pumped into, and a suitable filter plant provided. That is customary in many of the towns in the Ohio valley.

But I might say that I am interested in the land. Of course, I am a little different than some people who farm and it's necessary to make a living. I sympathize with them if their productive land is taken away from them.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Scholtz.

Mr. BAILEY. I have a few people from Culpeper County whose names I would like to read into the record. Our time is gone, and we will not use these men. If it meets with the approval of the committee, I would like to have them rise as I call them: R. Maxwell Willis, of Culpeper; Mr. Gordon Harris of Culpeper; Mr. G. William Mitchell, treasurer of Culpeper County; Mrs. Melville Church, farmer of Culpeper County; and Mr. M. T. Ankers, past president of the Ruritan Club and member of the farm bureau.

Gentlemen, I am sorry we have let the time get away from us and that we do not have the time to let you gentlemen speak.

But they are very much interested in this project.

Now, from Orange County we have Mr. Jim Todd, treasurer of Orange County; Mr. Howard Noell, the town manager; Mr. G. W. Peyton, budget director; Mr. John C. Moore, Orange-Madison Farm Bureau; Mr. Jim Green, who is the editor of the Orange Review.

We have these gentlemen here whom we do not have time to put on to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask Mr. Farrell Thomas, with your permission, to come forward at this time. Then we have one more speaker and we will close out our side.

Mr. DAVIS. All right.

STATEMENT OF MR. AND MRS. FARRELL THOMAS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to let my wife read this statement because she reads better than I do. We have some pictures here that we would like the members of the committee to look at of some of this farmland that will be destroyed by the dam.

Mrs. THOMAS. Our names are Farrell and Mary Lou Thomas. We are farmers, testifying as private citizens. We have a 92-acre farm, 7 acres woods, 40 acres pasture, and 45 acres cropland. This sounds very small after all these large farms, but it is very dear to us.

We are now in the process of building a herd of cattle. We have 16 head.

About half our cropland will produce 3½ tons of lespedeza hay per acre. The State average is only about 1½ tons per acre. The rest of our farm's production is good.

Approximately 70 acres of our farm will be destroyed by this project.

Soil and earth with proper cover can utilize and store more water than great reservoirs way down stream, and evaporation is less. The second best place to store water is in farm ponds. They are fast becoming a storage place as much as the barn or granary. Storing water for dry spells is just as important as storing hay and grain for winter use.

Every farmer, according to the riparian rights, has the right to catch all the water that falls on his farm. The United States Department of Agriculture says he can catch about one-half of the 35 percent runoff. I refer you to Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress.

Fredericksburg has told you what a hard time they had last summer during the drought. They couldn't wash cars, water lawns or gardens, and their sewage was ponding up right off downtown. That must have made it a very pleasant city. I understand that they have been warned about dumping waste in the river.

Fredericksburg has never provided itself with a city reservoir or a sewage disposal plant. The above and following reasons are why Fredericksburg wants the dam. They want the Government to spend some money in their town. They seem to think you have a printing press up here that makes dollar bills which never have to be paid back.

Meanwhile, during the drought, farmers upstream were having equally or more serious times. Their fields and pastures became parched, and their stores of feed became empty. Many wells and streams dried up, and their cattle became poor and underfed.

Someone around Fredericksburg has put it out that unless this dam is built 240 feet above sea level the Sylvania plant will have to leave town. I believe that this lake would lose more water by evaporation than is used by both Fredericksburg and the Sylvania plant. I understand that the plant uses 30 million gallons a day, a greater part of which is reclaimed, and only a small fraction is bought from the city.

I call your attention to the Army engineers' contour map of this area. Of an elevation up to 190 feet above sea level the banks are very steep, but from this elevation to 240 or 260 the terrain changes almost abruptly in most places. From the dam site to the far reaches of the reservoir you will see some of our Nation's best farms. The building of this dam would destroy them. At 190 feet the total area of the reservoir would be only about half as large as at 240 feet. It is above the elevation of 190 feet that causes the greatest amount of opposition.

We have no opposition to the progress of Fredericksburg, because their progress is our progress.

The following distances are direct. From the dam site to the Potomac River is less than 15 miles. This means that water recreation is no great demand. The distance from the dam site to the extreme edge of watershed is only about 56 miles. From dam site to the farthest part of the fringe area of lake is approximately 28 miles. Distance from extreme edge of fringe area of lake to extreme edge of watershed is approximately the same as length of lake, 28 miles. Distance from the coal fields to this dam site, about 200 miles.

In this Rappahannock River Basin watershed there are now approximately 500 farm ponds. In 1943 there were only 20. In 1950 there were 200. The total number of ponds to be completed in 1955 is 175. If the rate from 1950 to 1955 continues, the number in 1975 will be 1,700.

The total number of irrigation units in 1950 was zero. The number in the spring of 1955 is 18. At this rate, the number in 1975 will be 90.

Mr. JONES. May I ask you a question at that point? Have you taken any calculation of how much land will be irrigated by the construction in 1975 of that many ponds?

Mrs. THOMAS. The problem will be that of the individual farms. They can build the ponds as large as they want. In other words, it won't flood out the neighbors by the ponds they build.

So I predict from these figures that the flow of water in the rivers will not be great enough for a power dam. I refer you to an article by Farrar Shelton in the March issue of The Southern Planter, which states that in a dry spell 40 to 50 irrigation units between Lynchburg and Richmond, Va. could jeopardize the water supply of Richmond.

The Rapidan and Rappahannock are small and short rivers above the dam site, much smaller than the James above Richmond.

Farmers will use every method possible to slow down and store all the water they can. That will mean less flow in the rivers—only about half as much as now—and damaging floods will be almost impossible, although there will be enough water for municipal use.

Now, on four farms in our area there are 600 acres of corn yielding 15 barrels per acre, 600 acres of small grain yielding 50 bushels per acre, 800 acres of hay yielding 2 tons per acre. There are 27 houses. Combined gross income of these farms is approximately $239,000 per year. Wages paid to farm labor is $52,500 per year. Taxes paid on land for these farms is $2,512.70 per year. Additional taxes on properties of these farms would probably run the figure well above $5,000. I'm speaking of only 4 of the better farm units out of approximately 140-some units that would be crippled so badly they could not operate.

If these figures were true for the total number of farm units in the entire area, which are a little high for an overall average, you can see what the total loss would be on 140-some units.

Good land, properly treated, will still be producing crops 7,000 years from now, whereas a dam such as this will fill with silt in 100 years.

If you were going to buy a farm, and there were two for sale at the same price, one producing approximately 12 gallons of milk per day and the other 220 gallons but the production costs on the one producing 220 were a little greater, which would you buy? This is approximately the same ratio as between the Possum Point Vepco plant and this proposed project.

I urge that a new survey be made, consulting both the Soil Conservation Service and the Army engineers. And may you seek God's guidance before you destroy His soil by the authorization of this bill.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the lady a question. For a long time I have been trying to get an answer on this question on this flood control back in the hills or what we call in Iowa "nailing the raindrop where it falls." That is, the building of these ponds. Now, what is the cost to the Government of the ponds that you are building in this area?

Mrs. THOMAS. I don't know. This is not necessarily a project for the Government. However, we would gladly accept their help should they want to give it. But many of us would be willing to build our own ponds to have water.

Mr. JONES. That is an accredited practice of ACP, is it not?

Mrs. THOMAS. Yes, sir. I do understand they do allow farmers a certain amount of money that can be used for farm ponds or buying lime or different things, whatever the farmer chooses.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is it not true though that a large percentage of the ponds built here, probably like they are in my area, cost the Government not 1 cent?

Mrs. THOMAS. That's right. Individuals do it themselves.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right. And then under the present law the only contribution the Government is making on one phase of the conservation program at least is to allow you to deduct from your income a certain percent of your income for the building of ponds or instituting conservation practices. Is that right?

Mrs. THOMAS. I believe it is, yes, sir.

Mr. RYLAND HEFLIN. I hate to keep jumping up. I was supposed to have been here this morning. I am a member of the committee of the ACP, and the Federal Government can pay up to 50 percent of the cost of a farm pond, which in Virginia we figure as 16 cents per cubic yard, figuring the average cost at about 32 cents. They can pay 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. DAVIS. Before you sit down, give your name to the reporter.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am Ryland Heflin of Stafford County.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. May I ask this gentleman a question?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Will you yield to a question, Mr. Heflin? Is it true or is it not true that it costs the Government less to solve the flood-control problem to do it by building ponds and dams back in the hills or nailing the raindrop? If it is flood control we wanted would it be cheaper to do it that way?

Mr. HEFLIN. I don't feel exactly qualified to answer that question, but I might say that the farmers of Virginia and I imagine that is true over the Nation I don't think have availed themselves of the opportunity of enjoying this Government assistance and building these ponds to the extent they should. I know in Virginia, many of our counties, we have a lot of funds coming back from the counties due to the fact that the farmer will not avail himself of the opportunity of using them.

Mr. DAVIS. Now, we just can't get that argument started about the big dam and the little ponds and the lakes, you know. That has been going on now for a long time, and it will keep on going. I live down on the lower Mississippi—Memphis—and we can just keep on arguing that. I am in favor of both programs, but I think it takes both to control the water really.

Mr. RICHARD SANFORD (Orange, Va.). I know personally that these 500 and some ponds just mentioned, probably 95 or 99 percent of those ponds, received no compensation from the ACP program. That was a local option in the county, and these ponds were constructed strictly by the owners, paid for by the owners, and ACP did not enter into them.

Mr. DAVIS. That is fine.

We are glad to close this meeting now. I hope that you feel that this subcommittee has been fair——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, we have one more speaker, please, sir. It will take about 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Really and truly, I think we have been fair. Now, you have been here 2 hours and 20 minutes as against the entire presentation this morning.

Mr. BAILEY. Call us down to 10 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. All right, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to introduce this gentleman—Mr. O. B. Jones, senior partner in the Rapidan Milling Co., area chairman of the flood emergency committee, Washington district, covering the Rapidan and Robertson River Basins. I feel he is qualified to talk on this subject because he has a lot of experience. He is also president of the National Soft Wheat Millers Association.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to present to you Mr. Otis B. Jones.

STATEMENT OF OTIS B. JONES, RAPIDAN MILLING CO.

Mr. O. B. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a great privilege to follow this attractive young lady, because I believe it woke the committee up.

I would like first to say Mr. Bailey has not stated his representation, but he is representing Orange, Culpeper, Fauquier Counties and Madison County at this meeting, and the total population of those counties is between 49,000 and 50,000. I would like to get that in the record, please.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. O. B. JONES. I have a summary here which will take approximately 15 minutes to read, but if I can file this with you——

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. We would be very happy to have you file it.

Mr. O. B. JONES. Just one or two facts in here which have not been touched on I would like to bring out if I may. But first I would like to say that as to the sponsor of the bill, H. R. 192, I have always supported him. I wish I could be in his camp this time, but we felt like to cooperate this time we would definitely be swallowed up by the water and lose our land—which reminds me of a short story which I would like to tell you folks, being later in the afternoon, of a hunter in the Blue Ridge who decided he would go up in the mountains to get him a new fur coat for the winter.

In walking along the paths of the mountains he met up with this big black bear, and the bear said, "Mr. Hunter, what are you hunting for this morning?"

He says, "I'm looking for a nice fur coat for winter."

The bear said, "Well, I'm looking for a breakfast. Suppose you come into my den and let's see if we can't get some cooperation. Maybe we both could get what we want."

So they did. He went into the den. And shortly the bear emerged licking his chops. The hunter had his fur coat. The bear had his breakfast. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, I am sure that our representatives would not want us to cooperate in that manner.

This gentleman over here to my right (Mr. Schwengel) asked a question about the Salem Church—why it needed so much water. I would like to answer that question, because they have just recently constructed a new church. The pastor is one of my best friends. And it is a Baptist Church.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Good.

Mr. O. B. JONES. I have made considerable study on the flow of water in the Rapidan River, which is a tributary of the Rappahannock, and I find that it takes at least 50 percent of all rainfall at the present time to effect the same rise in the river as it did 10 years ago. That is due entirely to the soil conservation program which you have in this district. And I would like to read one or two of these.

Soil conservation and reforestation have played a large part in flood control as well as aiding in drought periods. As an official weather observer for the station at Rapidan, Va., and several substations in the upper basin of the Rapidan River, and having made a continuous study of same, I have found that in the past 10 years, due to soil conservation becoming more effective each year through strip farming, pounds, and reforestation that at the present time it takes approximately 50 percent more rainfall in the same given period to effect the same flood stage as some 10 years ago, and, at the rate of the present construction of ponds, we believe that in another 10 years we landowners in this basin, and Fredericksburg, can forget about destructive floods.

Irrigation is becoming more popular each year and, while some is taken direct from the river or its tributaries, the trend is to take it from private ponds, and in the final analysis, each gallon used is water which would normally flow down the rivers. These ponds are now being built on specifications that provide approximately as much storage for flood control as for the pond itself, thereby holding back this rush of water and metering some out over a period of time.

We refer you to a release article by Mr. E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, titled "The Watershed Protection

Law" and reprinted in the March 1955 issue of the Southern Planter. Mr. Peterson says, "This is the first Government program that strikes at the base of the flood-control program."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield? I think it only proper and wise at this point to direct your attention to the fact that the watershed legislation that we passed in the last session of Congress did not change existing legislation one iota. The only change that we made in existing law is to provide that the Committee on Agriculture be the committee to consider flood-control resolutions of less than 5,000 acre-feet.

Now, here is what has happened. If we were to carry out concurrently flood control on a major stream and remedial works that go hand in hand with any major flood-control works, we would authorize works to be done by the Department of Agriculture through the Soil Conservation Service and qualify certain practices through the ACP program. Now, under existing legislation we cannot carry out those cooperative enterprises of flood control. Therefore, we have an entirely different situation. I am as anxious to see the flood control working out in the watershed as you are, but I hope in the future that the Congress can make these work concurrently and make them cooperatively, which cannot be done under existing legislation.

I want to make that observation because I would not want you to leave the committee feeling that the act we passed last year was something new and something different. As a matter of fact, this Committee on Public Works has passed over 52 authorizations to carry out the identical thing that would be carried out under the legislation passed last year.

As an example, in Virginia alone we passed in 1947 or 1948 the same type of program on the flood control on the Potomac River. So there hasn't been anything wrong with what has been done in the past except we did not provide sufficient dollars to do the work that we would like to see done.

I want that to be part of the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. sir. And that means that your time was taken out of the time of the witness, so his time is gone.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Jones, I want to apologize. I did not mean to trespass upon your time, and I did not think the chairman was going to be that rigid.

Mr. DAVIS. We are going to give you 3 minutes more, because that is what you took for yourself.

Mrs. SCOTT (Elkwood, Va.). May a lady leave you with one last word for the road?

Mr. DAVIS. Pardon me. Mr. Jones here is the last witness. Proceed, Mr. Jones.

Mr. O. B. JONES. Gentlemen, I will just file this with your secretary here and let the lady have her last word.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. O. B. JONES. I believe that would be most important. I have a lot of information on soil conservation.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Jones is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman, may it please you, gentlemen of this committee, that we present our objections to House bill 192 and strongly urge that you recommend a new survey, even before Congress appropriates any funds for the 220-foot limit already passed by the House in 1946, for reasons as listed below:

First. We ask for this committee to review the minutes on the hearing held before the Corps of Engineers February 7, 1944, and also the hearing before the Committee on Public Works later as, in our opinion, there have been no changes on any economical basis that would be favorable to the dam, but many sound economical changes have taken place in the past 11 years to strengthen the opposition.

Second. In 1944 the Corps of Engineers successfully set up 19 area committees for flood emergency in the Washington district, which includes the Rappahannock Basin. These committees work together for the benefit of all, and under the program, Fredericksburg can be alerted some 17 to 24 hours in advance about what flood stage to expect, unless they experience a cloudburst as on October 15, 1942 and, in which case, the Salem Church Dam would not be of any benefit, but this would be purely a local problem for their sewage system.

Third. Soil conservation and reforestation has played a large part in flood control, as well as aiding in drought periods. As an official weather observer for the station at Rapidan, Va., and several substations in the upper basin of the Rapidan River, and having made a continuous study of same, I have found that in the past 10 years, due to soil conservation becoming more effective each year through strip farming, ponds, and reforestation that at the present time it takes approximately 50 percent more rainfall in the same given period to effect the same flood stage as some 10 years ago and, at the rate of the present construction of ponds, we believe that in another 10 years we landowners in this basin, and Fredericksburg, can forget about destructive floods.

Fourth. Irrigation is becoming more popular each year and, while some is taken direct from the river or its tributaries, the trend is to take it from private ponds; but in the final analysis, each gallon used is water which would normally flow down the rivers.

These ponds are now being built on specifications that provide approximately as much storage for flood control as for the pond itself; thereby holding back this rush of water and metering same out over a period of time.

We refer you to a release article by Mr. E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, titled "The Watershed Protection Law" and reprinted in the March 1955 issue of the Southern Planter. Mr. Peterson says, "This is the first Government program that strikes at the base of the flood-control program."

Fifth. The official river gage near Fredericksburg shows for the 10-year period of 1945–54 the average of 14.88-inch runoff, which equals to 1,773 second-feet with a high of 26.02-inch runoff and 3,059 second-feet, and a low of 5.69-inch runoff and 670 second-feet, while during this period the rainfall at Rapidan had a high of 58.21 inches and a low of 33.30 inches with an average of 42.51 inches, this being an average of 0.74 inch above the normal of 41.77 inches.

On the above basis of 14.88-inch average annual runoff would make an average flow at the point of Salem Church Dam of approximately 1,773 second-feet or 106,380 cubic feet per minute and reducing this to take care of normal evaporation of a 21,000-acre lake and seepage in lake bottom of approximately 9,300 cubic feet per minute would mean the average 24-hour flow would be 97,000 cubic feet per minute, which would be equal to approximately 20,400 kilowatts based on 240-foot power pool, with a 177-foot head.

Also, based on the use of available storage during the critically dry period of 1930–32, the engineers' report states: "* * * the continuous power would be 8,100 kilowatts at Salem Church project * * *" (Doc. 119, p. 8).

The Corps of Engineers report calls for 54,500 kilowatts. Where do they get the water?

We predict that in another 5 years the flow of water at Fredericksburg will be curtailed at least 25 percent or more, due to the storage dams on farms, and irrigation, so we again urge for a further study as to where the water will come from to make enough power to amortize the dam, even at the 240-foot elevation.

Sixth. The Governor of Virginia set up in 1953 a Virginia Agricultural Legislative Council to study the water conservation and uses in Virginia and, while they will not make their report until July 14, 1955, statements by legislators and other prominent men are expressing their views of small dams on farms and on small tributaries of rivers for flood control and water conservation.

Seventh. Atomic power. A press release to the Associated Press under date of April 2, 1955, by W. Kenneath Davis, Director of AEC Division of Reaction Development, predicts atomic-energy plants alone will produce as much electricity in 1977 as our Nation currently uses, approximately 1 million kilowatts.

A release to the Associated Press by Francis K. McCune, General Electric vice president and general manager of the firm's atomic products division, made

the prediction before the University of Pennsylvania Institute of Investment Banking that 65 percent of all new generating installations will be atomic by 1980.

Another release to Associated Press under date of April 7, 1955, by the Atomic Energy Commission announced the proposal of 4 atomic powerplants, 1 each in Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Nebraska, with a total cost of $150 million, that would generate 455,000 kilowatts and that private interest was standing 90 percent of the cost.

Gentlemen, if my arithmetic is correct, this is about one-third the cost per kilowatt as the Salem Church Dam.

The foregoing statements show that a dam is not justified for flood control in the future for Fredericksburg.

The change that is taking place in the production of electric energy shows that waterpower on a small river, as we have in Fredericksburg, is uneconomically sound.

Also, if this dam is constructed, it would be a potential target for an enemy in case of war, and, should this happen, we would not like to say what would be left of the city of Fredericksburg which lies in a narrow gorge between Marye Heights and Chatham Heights. Let us hope that you will never give this a chance to happen.

Eighth. Flood control. That is this committee's chief concern. The Corps of Engineers' report clearly states that according to landmarks for the past 200 years, and with official records for about the past 100 years, that the 1942 flood was highest with the 1937 being second, and 1889 third largest floods on record, and that more damage was done to the farmland above Fredericksburg in the 1889 flood than in Fredericksburg, and that today with no navigation in the Rappahannock River in that area or wharves in Fredericksburg, and all business and industry, bridges, and so forth in this area have been moved to higher ground, that a flood at this time of the magnitude of the 1889 flood would not be destructive in Fredericksburg.

Why in 1937 and 1942 were these destructive floods the only ones on record of such destruction, and the runoff on these two rains so tremendous?

(*a*) Because in the 1918–29 period with timber prices high, most all timber was cut out of the upper Rappahannock Basin. For instance, at Orange, Va., a railroad was built to the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains and that area was stripped of all salable timber, leaving those acres exposed to rushing downstream of any rains that might occur.

(*b*) When farm products were high during World War I and after, every acre of farmland possible was plowed up for cultivation. Then came the depression of the 1930's, and this land, in most cases, was left to the elements without cover and abandoned, to make this period the criterion period of soil erosion; so conditions were perfect in the Rappahannock Basin for extreme floods.

It took a flood of the 1942 magnitude to start us in the right direction, and today, due to the magnificent progress made in soil-conservation practices and reforestation, and should this continue for another 10 years, we believe we will have flood control which will benefit everyone—farm, home, municipalities and industry—without the cost to our Government of some $50 million, and, most important, of taking some 40,000 acres of our best land out of production, losing our homes, farms, taxes, and the production of food and fiber from the many acres which, according to estimates of the Agriculture Department, we will need so badly for our Nation's economy within the next 30 to 40 years to feed and shelter the extra 40 million added to our population. So we appeal to this committee to save this land to provide for our children and grandchildren.

Gentlemen, let's give flood control an opportunity to work where it means something to our Nation's economy and not spend the millions at tidewater level to benefit a municipality and industry that wants, and thinks, the Government should provide them with water free and for them not to have to provide for their needs, as other municipalities.

This past Thursday, April 21, after a resolution was passed by the board of directors of the Orange County Chamber of Commerce on March 8, 1955, by a vote of 12 to 1 against the project, a group of members of this chamber, headed by a former campaign manager of the sponsor of this bill, and after much personal work favoring this project, the president of the chamber thought best to call an open meeting for the purpose of rescinding the former motion, and the chamber, with a membership of 110, succeeded in a vote of 22 to 10 and with many of them speaking an favor of the dam with the only reason listed as bene-

fits being that, "The Government was going to spend this $50 million sometime, somewhere, regardless; so why not take the gravy while it was flowing near Orange."

Gentlemen, we are certain that this intelligent committee, as well as the sponsor of this bill, along with Congress, would take this as an insult to their good judgment.

RECREATION

A letter from Mr. Bryan Bird to Mr. W. R. Graham, official reporter to the committee, House of Representatives, under date of May 17, 1946, clearly states that with the power-pool level at 240 feet we could expect a drawdown in certain periods to the 192-foot level. It further shows that the flood-pool elevation is 252.8 feet at the dam, this being the height of the spillway, and on this basis the height at Kellys Ford would be 259 or 6.2 feet higher than at dam, this being called the superelevation level, so it would be reasonable to expect the same percentage rise per mile to Remington and Rapidan and, if we then should have a flood of the 1942 stage, we could normally expect a height at these 2 points at some 9 feet higher than in 1942, which would, without question, destroy almost entirely this municipality and village, as well as the Southern Railway at Remington, not saying anything about the valuable rural and farm properties.

What kind of recreation could be expected on a drawdown from 252.8 feet to 192 feet or 60.8 feet or 30 miles of mud flats on the Rapidan River from 1 mile below Rapidan to Elys Ford? This would not leave a gallon of water outside of the riverbed in Orange County.

SUMMARY

I attach a reprint of a letter received from one of the landowners in Orange County affected by the flood.

We urge your careful consideration of not reporting favorably on bill H. R. 192 so as not to destroy our economy in these counties, and let us keep our homes, farms, and industry, instead of these being destroyed for the wishes of others, when facts plainly show same is not necessary.

We again urge you to ask for a restudy of this project as to facts, costs, and benefits, as the report as arrived at over 10 years ago I am certain you will agree is not a true fact as they are today.

Gentlemen, we appreciate your time and consideration, and we thank you.

Mr. DAVIS. Mrs. Scott is not on the agenda as a witness. We permitted her to make an observation awhile ago. Mrs. Scott, how long will it take you?

Mrs. SCOTT. Just a moment. Just one thought for you gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF MRS. SCOTT, ELKWOOD, VA.

We give you beef, we give you dairy products from this bottomland, and we give you food products that are necessary to our existence and to all of yours, and I think the Sylvania Co. down there makes electrical products, and I'd just like you to think which one is most important to you and to me and to all of us.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to thank all of you——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to thank you and your committee for the fine way in which you have handled this farm session this afternoon. I want to say we have no fight with Fredericksburg or anyone else. We are not here with animosity in our hearts. We just hope you can work this out so that Fredericksburg will be helped as well as our land will be saved. We are a neighbor to Fredericksburg, and we are not here to be hostile to them.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you. We want to remind you, too, that Judge Smith is the representative of all you folks in that district.

Mr. BAILEY. We know Judge Smith better than you.

The last thing I want to do is to place this petition with several hundred names on it from Culpeper County in opposition in the record.

Mr. DAVIS. That will be part of the record.

(The petition is as follows:)

To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned, business firms of Culpeper County, oppose any dam on the Rappahannock River that would affect land above the elevation of 220 feet above sea level. Any elevation over this height would destroy valuable river and creek bottomland. It would take much less acreage at this height than it would take at 240 feet.

E. MURPHY HOFFMAN
(and 99 others).

Mr. DAVIS. The committee will consider this matter in executive session at a date to be announced later.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p. m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the chairman.)

×